

VOL. X. No. 28.]

[JUNE 1931

*Price Six Shillings net: Annual Subscription 16/6 post free.*

*In America \$1 60 Annual Subscription, \$4 20 (post free).*

# THE SLAVONIC AND EAST EUROPEAN REVIEW

A Survey  
of the Peoples of Eastern Europe,  
Their History, Economics, Philology and Literature

EDITORS

BERNARD PARES R. W. SETON-WATSON

AMERICAN CONTRIBUTING EDITORS:

SAMUEL N. HARPER ROBERT J. KERNER GEORGE R. NOYES

## CONTENTS

The Story of My Dovecot. From the Russian of I. BABEL  
Mrs. Ruska's Kind Heart. From the Czech of JAN NERUDA.  
Hassan Chaushi. From the Serbo-Croat of GRIGORIJE BOŽOVIĆ  
Poetry from the Russian of PUSHKIN, TURGENEV, ALEXIS TOLSTOY and MINSKY,  
and the Serbo-Croat of MILAN RAKIĆ.

Kasprowicz	-	-	-	-	WACŁAW BOROWY.
Vladimir Solovyev (II)	-	-	-	-	JANKO LAVRIN.
The Meaning of Art	-	-	-	-	VLADIMIR SOLOVYEV.
Studies in Yugoslav Psychology (III)	-	-	-	-	JOVAN CVIJIĆ.

The Significance of the Five Year Plan	-	-	MAURICE DOBB.
The Background of Political Parties in Czechoslovakia	-	-	EMANUEL ČAPEK
Nationality and the New Czechoslovak Census	-	-	ANTONÍN BOHÁČ.
The Ukrainian Question in Poland	-	-	COUNT STANISLAS ŁOŚ.
Polish Self-Help under Prussian Rule	-	-	THE EARL OF ONSLOW.

(For other articles see over)

PUBLISHED BY EYRE & SPOTTISWOODE (PUBLISHERS), LTD.,  
6, GREAT NEW STREET, LONDON, E.C. 4

FOR THE

# LIST OF CONTENTS (continued)

Early Relations of England and Ukraine  
The Bosnian Annexation Crisis (III)

ELIE BORSHAK  
BERNADOTTE E. SCHMITT

OBITUARY — Sir Charles Eliot (Oliver Elton and Sir B. Paes) Auguste Gauvain (R. W. Seton-Watson), Josef Zubatý (Bohuslav Havranek), Viktor Dyk (Arne Novák), Vladimír Hoppé (J. Hanák) L. I. Petrazycki (A. F. Meyendorff) Z. Debicki (W. B.), Antoni Prochaska (W. B.), Alfred L. P. Dennis (George H. Blakeslee)

Unprinted Documents The Anglo-Austrian Understanding of 1877 (I)  
Edited by DWIGHT E. LEE

Soviet Agricultural Legislation

Slavonic Courses at American Universities (Arthur I. Andrews)

## REVIEWS —

*A Polish View of Byron* A. Tretiak  
*Byron and the Yugoslavs* Ilija Petrović  
*The Polish Heritage of Joseph Conrad* Gustav Morf  
*A Polish Anthology* W. Borowy (St. Windakiewicz)  
*Modern Russian Philosophy* N. Lossky (Natalie Duddington)  
*Glimpses of High Politics* N. V. Charykov (James D. Allen)  
*The Question of Greek Independence* C. W. Crawley (R. W. Seton-Watson)  
*La Formation de la Yougoslavie* Emile Haumant (R. W. Seton-Watson)  
*The Little Entente* John O. Crane (R. W. Seton-Watson)  
*Russland* Fritz Epstein (A. F. M.)  
*Making Bolsheviks* Samuel N. Harper (B. P.)  
*Traité de Droit Civil et Commercial des Soviets* (A. F. M.)  
*Die Polnische Literatur* J. Kleiner (W. B.)  
*Notes on Polish Books* (W. Borowy)  
*Elementary Polish Grammar* P. Szymank (W. Borowy)  
*New Czechoslovak Periodicals* (J. Hanák)  
*South Eastern Affairs*

## NOTICES

Contents of the "Slavonic Review" are indexed in the "International Index to Periodicals"

Foreign Contributors are earnestly requested to submit articles in the original language, and not in English Translations, as the Editors prefer to make their own arrangements with regard to translation

Contributors to "The Slavonic Review" in America are desired to send their contributions, whether articles or reviews, to one of the American Contributing Editors. Professor Samuel N. Harper, 5728, Woodlawn Avenue, Chicago; Professor Robert J. Kerner, 1320, Arch Street, Berkeley, Cal., Professor George R. Noyes, 1486, Greenwood Terrace, Berkeley, Cal. Books for review, published in America, should be sent to Professor Kerner.

All Editorial communications with regard to "The Slavonic Review" should be addressed to the Editors at 40 Torrington Square, London, W.C.1

# THE SLAVONIC REVIEW

VOL. X. No. 28.

JUNE, 1931.

---

## THE STORY OF MY DOVECOTE

INSCRIBED TO MAXIM GORKY.

*Translated from the Russian of I. BABEL by D. S. MIRSKY.*

WHEN I was a small boy I longed to have a dovecote. I never longed for anything as much as I did for that dovecote. I was nine when my father promised to give me money to buy the wood and three pairs of pigeons. It was then the year 1904. I was preparing for my examination for the preparatory form of the Nikolayev gymnasium. My parents lived in the town of Nikolayev in the province of Kherson. That province exists no longer: our town is now part of the Odessa district.

I was only nine, and I was afraid of the examinations. Now, after twenty years, it is very difficult to express how dreadfully afraid I was. In each of the subjects—Russian and arithmetic—I could not afford to get less than five.<sup>1</sup> The percentage for Jews in our gymnasium was low—five per cent. Of forty boys admitted to the preparatory form no more than two might be Jews. The teachers used to put tailtwisters to these boys; no one used to be asked such tailtwisters as we were. That is why my father, when he promised me the pigeons, laid it down as a condition that I should get five plus<sup>2</sup> in both subjects. He tormented me so, that I subsided into a continuous daydream, a child's endless dream of despair. I went to the examination in that state, and passed first.

I had a talent for learning. The teachers, however ingenious they tried to be, could not rob me of my intelligence or of my memory. I had a talent for learning, and got five in both subjects. But afterwards everything changed. Khariton Efrussi, the corn merchant who exported wheat to Marseilles, gave a bribe of

<sup>1</sup> That is, full marks.

<sup>2</sup> That is, full marks with special mention.

500 roubles for his son, my five was changed to five minus, and it was the Efrussi boy and not I who was admitted to the gymnasium. My father was very much distressed by this development. Ever since I had been six, he had taught me all the subjects that it was possible to teach. The affair of the minus brought him to a state of despair. He was going to thrash Efrussi or bribe two dockers to thrash him, but my mother dissuaded him from such evil thoughts, and I began to prepare for another examination, for the following year and for the first form. Behind my back, my parents persuaded my tutor to coach me in one year for both the preparatory and the first form, and as we were by way of despairing of everything, I learned three books by heart. These books were: Smirnovsky's grammar, Evtushevsky's book of sums, and Putsykovich's elementary Russian history. These books are no longer used in schools, but I learned them by heart, and the following year at the examination in Russian the schoolmaster Karavayev gave me the unattainable five plus. Our small town whispered for quite a long time about my unusual success, and my father was so pathetically proud of it that I could no longer bear to think of the fussy, changeable life he lived, or of how he submitted to all turns of fate, exulting over them, or undermined by them.

I liked the schoolmaster Karavayev better than my father. Karavayev was a rosy indignant man, a former Moscow student. He was scarcely thirty. The colour on his manly cheeks was like the colour on the cheeks of peasant boys who are too young for hard work, he had a wart on his cheek, but it did not look repulsive, and a tuft of ashy hair—like a cat's—grew out of it. Besides Karavayev at the examination there was the Assistant-Curator Pyatnitsky, who was regarded as an important personage in the gymnasium and in the whole province. The Assistant Curator asked me about Peter the Great, a feeling of oblivion came over me, a feeling of the approaching end and of an opening abyss, a dry abyss paved with ecstasy and despair.

About Peter the Great, I knew by heart the passages from Putsykovich's book and the poetry by Pushkin. I said the poetry with a sob in my voice, flowery human faces suddenly rolled into my eyes, mixing like the cards of a newly opened pack. While they were being shuffled at the bottom of my eyes, trembling, erect, in a hurry I went on screaming out the Pushkin lines with all my might. I went on screaming for a long time, and no one thought of interrupting the mad shrieking and muttering. Through the purple blindness, through the furious freedom that had possessed me,



I only saw the old face of Pyatnitsky bent forward, and his silvery beard. He never interrupted me and only spoke to Karavayev, who was exulting on my behalf and on that of Pushkin.

"What a race," the old man murmured, "these yids of yours! They've got the devil in them . . . ."

And when I stopped, he said

"Good, you may go, little man"

I went out of the class-room into the corridor and there, leaning back against the whitewashed wall, I began to recover from the spasms of my overwrought dreams. The Russian boys were playing around me, the school bell hanging over the flight of stairs, a small attendant was dozing in a tumble-down chair. I looked at the attendant and by degrees came to my senses. The boys gathered round me from all sides. They were going to pinch me or just to play with me, but suddenly Pyatnitsky appeared in the corridor. He passed me, but stopped for a moment, and his coat moved on his back in a slow and heavy wave. I saw hesitation in that broad, fleshy, easy-going back and I moved towards the old man.

"Children," he said to the schoolboys, "do not do anything to this boy," and he put a soft, fat hand on my shoulder.

"Little man," said Assistant-Curator Pyatnitsky, turning to me, "tell your father that you have been admitted to the first form"

A splendid star flashed on his heart, the orders tinkled on the lapel of his coat, and his big black uniformed body moved away on straight legs. It was jammed in by the sombre walls, it passed between them as a barge between the high banks of a canal, and it disappeared in the door of the headmaster's study. The little attendant carried tea for him with a solemn noise, and I ran home to our shop.

In our shop there sat a peasant customer who was scratching his head in indecision. Catching sight of me, my father abandoned the peasant and unhesitatingly believed my story. He cried out to the shop assistant to close the shop and ran off to the Cathedral Square to buy me a cap with the badge. My poor mother had difficulty in tearing me away from the frenzied man. My mother was pale, she was peering into the future. Now she stroked me, and now pushed me away with repulsion. She said that the names of all those admitted to the gymnasium were published in the papers, and that God would punish us and people would mock at us if we bought uniforms before it was time. My mother was pale, she peered into my eyes questioning destiny and looked at me with bitter pity, as she would at a cripple, because she knew the bad luck of our family.

All the men in our family were of a confiding disposition and were quick at hasty action, we had no luck in anything. My grandfather had been rabbi at Belaya-Tserkov, he was dismissed on a charge of blasphemy, and lived another forty years noisily and in great poverty, studying foreign languages, at eighty he went mad. My uncle Leo, my father's brother, studied at the Yeshivot at Volozhin, ran away from conscription in 1892, eloping with the daughter of a commissariat officer of the Military Command of Kiev. Uncle Leo took this woman with him to Los Angeles, in California, abandoned her there, and died in a house of ill fame among negroes and Malays. After his death the American police sent us from Los Angeles his worldly goods—a large trunk bound with brown iron clasps. The trunk contained weights for gymnastics, locks of women's hair, grandfather's praying-cap, riding sticks with gold knobs, and boxes inlaid with cheap pearls and full of tea. Of all the family there remained only my mad uncle Simon, who lived in Odessa, my father and myself. But my father was unspeakably confiding with people, so that they took exception to the ecstasies of his affection, never forgave him and invariably betrayed him. In consequence my father believed that his life was governed by a malignant destiny, an inexplicable being that pursued him and was in all respects unlike himself. And so it was that of all our family there was only myself left for my mother. Like all Jews, I was undersized, puny and suffered from headaches when I studied. All this was clear to Rachel, my mother, who was never blinded by the beggar's pride of my father or by his unintelligible conviction that some day our ancient family would become stronger and grander than other people on earth. She expected no success for us, she did not place her ambition in a uniform, and the only thing she allowed me to do was to have a big portrait taken at the photographer's. And still in the end we had to buy a cap with the badge.

On 20th September, 1905, the list of those admitted to the first form was posted at the gymnasium. It included my name. All our relatives went to see this piece of paper, and even Shoil, my grandfather's first cousin, came to the gymnasium. I liked the boastful old man because he sold fish in the market. His fat hands were always wet, covered with scales and smelt of beautiful worlds of coolness. What made Shoil different from ordinary people was also the tall tales he told of the Polish Insurrection of 1863. Years ago Shoil had been an innkeeper at Skvira; he had seen how the soldiers of Nicholas I shot Count Godlewski and other rebels. It may be, he had seen nothing. Now I know all right that Shoil was nothing

but an old ignoramus and a naive liar, but I never forgot his yarns—they were very good ones. And so even silly Shoil came to the gymnasium to read the list that contained my name, and the same night, no longer afraid of anyone, no longer afraid that there was no one in the world to love him, he danced and stamped at our beggar's ball.

My father gave the dance to celebrate his joy and invited to it his colleagues—grain dealers, estate agents and travellers in agricultural machinery. These travellers knew how to palm off machinery on anyone. The peasants and the squires dreaded them, there was no way of escaping them without buying something. Of all Jews the travellers were the jolliest, the ones who had seen most of the world. At our party they sang Hassid songs, which consisted of only three words, but could be sung for a very long time with a great variety of comic intonations. The touching charm of these intonations can be appreciated only by those who have had the opportunity of celebrating the Passover with the Hassidim or who have been in their noisy synagogues in Volhynia. Besides the travellers, among our guests was old Liebermann, who taught me the Torah and Hebrew. At our house he was called Monsieur Liebermann. He took more Bessarabian wine than was good for him; the traditional silken strings showed from under his red waistcoat, and he toasted me in Hebrew. In his speech the old man said that at the examination I had defeated all my enemies, the fat-cheeked Russian boys and the sons of the unmannerly rich Jews. Even so of old had David, King of Judah, defeated Goliath, and even as I had triumphed over Goliath so would our unbending people triumph by the force of its brains over its enemies who surrounded us and were waiting for our blood. Having said this, Monsieur Liebermann burst into tears, and drank some more wine, while he wept and shouted: "Vivat." The guests took him into a circle and began an old-fashioned quadrille with him as at a wedding in a Jewish country town. Everyone was merry at our dance, even my mother got drunk, though she disliked spirits and could never understand how people could enjoy them. All Russians she accordingly regarded as mad, and could not understand how women were able to live with Russian husbands.

But it was only rather later that our happy days began. For my mother they began as she got used to the happiness of making sandwiches for me before I left for school and when she went shopping for all the odds and ends of my equipment—pencil case, money box, satchel, new books in cardboard bindings and exercise books in shining covers. No one feels the novelty of things with

greater force than do children. They tremble at the smell of it, like dogs that have scented a hare, and become the victims of a madness which later on, when we grow up, is called inspiration. And this pure, childlike sense of property over things that smelt tender and moist, and of the coolness of new things, caught hold of my mother. It took us a month to get accustomed to the pencil case and to my drinking my tea at the edge of the great lighted table and gathering my books into my satchel in the unforgettable half-light of morning. It took us a month to get accustomed to this happy life of ours, and it was only when the first quarter was over that I remembered about my pigeons.

I had got everything ready for them—one rouble fifty and a dove-cote that had been made out of a box by great-uncle Shōil. It had holes for twelve pairs of pigeons, fretwork on the roof and a special grating which I had invented so as more easily to decoy strange birds. Everything was ready. On Sunday the 20th of October I was to go to the game market, but unexpected misfortunes barred my way.

The date of my narrative—of my admission to the first form of the gymnasium—was the autumn of 1905. The Tsar Nicholas had granted a Constitution to the Russian people. Orators in threadbare overcoats were mounting the street posts before the Town Hall and making speeches to the people. At night firing was heard in the streets, and my mother did not want to let me go to the game market. On the morning of the twentieth our neighbours' boys flew a kite under the very windows of the police station, and our water carrier, abandoning all his work, walked the streets, his hair greased and his face red. Then we saw the boys of the baker Kalistov drag out into the street a leather-covered vaulting horse and do gymnastics in the middle of the road. No one stopped them, and the policeman Semernikov even egged them on to jump higher. Semernikov wore a silk handwoven girdle, and his boots were blacked that day more shinily than they had ever been before. It was this policeman accoutred in this way against all regulations that frightened my mother most of all, and it was on his account that she did not let me go, but I stole out into the street through the back and ran to the game market, which was some distance off, on the other side of the railway station.

Ivan Nikodimych, the pigeon dealer, sat in his usual place in the game market. Besides pigeons he had rabbits for sale and a peacock. The peacock sat on a perch with his brilliant tail spread out and turned his indifferent beautiful head from side to side. He

had a twisted string tied round his leg, the other end of the string was held down by the wicker chair of Ivan Nikodimych. As soon as I was there I bought from the old man a pair of cherry-coloured pigeons with ruffled bushy tails, and another pair of tuft-headed ones, and put them in a bag under my coat. I had forty kopeks left after the purchase, but the old man did not want to let me have a pair of Kryukov pigeons for that money. What I liked about the Kryukov pigeons was their beaks, which were short, granulated, friendly looking. Forty kopeks was a fair price for them, but the dealer wanted more and turned away from me his yellow face, marked by the unsocial passions of the birdcatcher. When closing time was approaching, Ivan Nikodimych called me up. Everything turned out as I had thought, everything turned out badly.

About twelve or a little later a man in felt boots crossed the market place. He walked lightly as if his legs were puffed, a pair of excited eyes burned in his sodden face.

"Ivan Nikodimych," he said as he passed by the birdcatcher, "down tools, in the town the Jerusalem gentry are being given a constitution. In the fish market grandfather Babel has been helped to death . . ."

He said this and lightly passed among the cages like a barefooted ploughman walking along a boundary.

"Very wrong," muttered Ivan Nikodimych after him. "Very wrong," he shouted in a still severer voice, and began gathering in the rabbits and the peacock and poked the forty kopek Kryukov pigeons my way. I hid them under my coat and watched the people emptying out of the game market. The peacock on the shoulder of Ivan Nikodimych was the last to leave. He perched there like the sun in the raw sky of autumn, he perched as July does in the tall, cold grass. I watched the old man go with his cobbler's chair and his precious cages wrapped up in coloured rags. Now the market was empty, and shooting was going on quite near. Then I started running towards the railway station, crossed the square and ran into a deserted side street with yellow earth. At the end of the side street there sat in his invalid chair Makarenko, the legless cripple, who used to wheel himself about the town hawking cigarettes from a tray. The boys in our street used to buy cigarettes from him; he was a favourite of the children, and I made for him as I ran into the side street.

"Makarenko," I said, breathless with running, and stroked his shoulder, "do you happen to have seen my great-uncle Shoil?"

But the cripple made no reply. His coarse face—a heap of red fat, like bunches of flesh and iron—was translucent. He was fidgeting in his chair in terrible excitement, and Katyusha, his wife, her padded bottom turned towards me, was sorting something that lay on the ground.

“How many have you counted?” asked the cripple and moved towards the woman with all his body, as if he knew beforehand that her answer would be unbearable to him.

“Fourteen gaiters,” said Katyusha, without unbending, “six sheets. I am counting the mobcaps now.”

“Mobcaps,” cried Makarenko, suffocating and letting out a sound as though he were weeping. “I see, God must have visited me that I must answer for everyone. . . The others are carrying linen in whole big pieces, the others get all they ought to, and we—nothing but mobcaps.”

And indeed, a woman, her handsome face flushed, came running down the street. She had an armful of fezzes in one arm and a piece of cloth in the other. In a happy, desperate voice she was calling back her scattered children, her silk dress and her blue jacket flew in the air behind her, and she paid no attention to Makarenko who rolled after her in his chair. The cripple could not overtake her, his wheels rattled, he worked the levers with all his strength, but still he could not come up with her.

“Madame,” he shouted deafeningly, “for God’s sake, Madame, where did you take that cotton cloth?”

But the woman with the flying dress was gone. A ramshackle cart popped from behind the corner where she had disappeared. A peasant lad stood erect in the cart.

“Where has everybody gone?” the lad asked, and raised a red rein above the horses, who came jumping along in their collars.

“Everybody is in the Cathedral Square now,” said Makarenko in an imploring tone, “all the people are there, my good fellow, whatever you find, bring it to me. I buy everything.”

But as soon as he had heard that it was the Cathedral Square, the lad hurried on. He bent over the front of the cart and lashed his piebald jades. The horses jumped up like calves with their dirty rumps and started galloping. The yellow side street was once again left deserted and yellow, then the cripple turned his dimmed eyes in my direction.

“Is it that God has visited me?” he said in a lifeless voice. “Is it that I am the Son of Man, then?”

And Makarenko stretched out towards me his hand, speckled with an apopleptic leprosy.

"What have you got in your wallet there?" he said, and took the bag which had been warming my heart.

With his thick hand the cripple dived in to the pigeons and extracted the cherry-coloured female from the bottom of the bag. With her feet turned up the bird lay on his hand.

"Pigeons," said Makarenko, and his wheels creaked as he drove up to me. "Pigeons," he repeated, like an unescapable echo, and struck me on the cheek

. He struck me with all his might, with his fist, the pigeon broke against my temple, Katyusha's padded bottom seemed to topple over in front of me, and in my new uniform coat I fell to the ground.

"All their seed must be destroyed," Katyusha then said, bending over the mobcaps "All their seed, that's what I can't stand, and their stinking men . . ."

She went on to say something more about our "seed." I lay on the ground, and the guts of the crushed bird trickled down my temple. They trickled down my cheeks, wriggling, spouting and blinding me. The tender guts of the pigeon crawled down my forehead, and I tried to shut my remaining eye so as not to see the world that spread in front of me. That world was small and dreadful. A stone lay before my eyes, a stone indented like a hag's face with a big jaw, there was also a bit of string and a bunch of feathers, still throbbing. My world was small and dreadful. I shut my eyes so as not to see it and pressed closer to the earth that lay beneath me in comforting silence. That trodden earth was in every way unlike this life of ours, or the expectation of examinations in our life. Somewhere far away misfortune rode over it on a jaunting horse, but the noise of the hoofs grew fainter, ceased, and silence, the bitter silence that sometimes smites a miserable child, suddenly wiped out the dividing line between my body and the earth, which moved nowhere. My earth smelt of its damp entrails, of graves, of flowers. I smelt the smell and I wept fearlessly. Then I walked along a strange street lined with white boxes. I walked attired in blood-stained feathers, alone between the pavements, clean as on a Sunday, and cried more bitterly, completely and happily than I ever afterwards cried in my life. The white telephone lines sang above my head, a fussy mongrel was running in front of me, and in a side street a young peasant in a waistcoat was breaking a window frame in the house of Khariton Efrussi. He was breaking it with a wooden hammer,

raising it with all his body and breathing heavily, he smiled in all directions a good-natured smile of excitement, perspiration and vital strength. The street was filled with the breaking, crackling and singing of the breaking wood. The man was breaking the frame simply in order that he might bend over, perspire and shout out unusual words in an unknown un-Russian tongue. He went on shouting them out and singing, his blue eyes almost bulging out of his head, until a church procession coming from the Town Hall debouched into the street. Old men with dyed beards carried the portrait of a carefully combed Tsar, church banners with sepulchral saints on them tossed over the procession, and frenzied old women moved forward unrepressibly. The man in the waistcoat, when he saw the procession, pressed his hammer to his breast and ran after the church-banners, while I, waiting for the procession to pass by, found my way to our house. It was empty, our house was. Its white doors were thrown open, the grass by the dovecote trodden down. Kuzma alone had not left the premises. Kuzma the doorkeeper was sitting in the shed by the side of the corpse of Shoil and was laying out the body.

"The wind carries you about like an evil chip," the old man said when he saw me, "running away like that for a whole age . . . You see how the people have done for your great-uncle."

Kuzma snuffled, turned away and began extracting a fish from the slit of great-uncle's trousers. Two fishes had been poked into great-uncle one into the slit of his trousers, the other into his mouth, and though the old man was dead one of the fishes was alive and wriggling.

"They did for great-uncle, only him," said Kuzma, as he threw the fish to the cat, "he swore at all the crowd like hell, he cursed them all through, fine work . . . You may just as well fetch coppers for his eyes."

But, aged ten as I was, I did not know why coppers could be wanted by a dead man.

"Kuzma," I whispered, "save us."

And I came up to the doorkeeper, hugged his old crooked, humped back, and looked at great-uncle from behind that friendly back. Shoil was lying on some shavings, his chest broken in, his beard poking upwards, his bare feet in coarse shoes. His feet which pointed away from each other were dirty, purple, dead. Kuzma fussed round them, then he tied up the jaw and tried to see what else he could do for the body. He went on bustling about as if he were



putting in some improvement in his house, and calmed down only after he had combed the dead man's beard

"He cursed all of them," he said with a smile, and looked at the corpse with affection. "Had he had the Tartars against him, he would have driven them off, but then Russians came up and Russian women with them, the Katsaps<sup>3</sup> won't be done out of spilling blood. I know the Katsaps . . ."

The doorkeeper heaped up some more shavings round the body, threw off his carpenter's apron and took me by the hand.

"Now we'll go to your father," he muttered, pressing me still closer, "your father has been looking for you ever 'since the morning. What if he dies of it!"

And Kuzma and I walked to the house of the Tax Inspector, where my parents had hidden themselves from the pogrom.

## MRS. RUSKA'S KIND HEART

*From the Czech of JAN NERUDA*

*Translated by N B JOPSON.*

JOSEPH VELŠ, merchant, was one of the most well-to-do shopkeepers of the Malá Strana. I think he had in his shop absolutely all the products of India and Africa, from liquorice and burnt ivory for polishing to gold powder. And his shop on the square was crowded out the whole day long. Mr. Velš spent all his time in the shop except for the hour of the High Mass services on Sundays at St. Vitus Church and the occasional grand parades of the Prague Citizens' Corps. Mr. Velš, you see, was a sharpshooter, first company, first squad, and always the third man to the right of Lieutenant Nedoma. He would have liked to serve all his shop customers himself, although he had two assistants and two apprentices, but still he had a nod and a word of greeting and a smile for those he could not serve. Mr. Velš had indeed a perpetual smile, whether he was in his shop or in the street or at church—wherever he was, in fact, his business smile had become engrained into his facial muscles and could not leave them. He was a jolly-looking old boy, rather short and stout, with his smile and his head always a-nod. In the shop he wore a flat cap and a leathern apron, and outside a long blue frock coat with golden buttons and a squat silk hat.

<sup>3</sup> A derogatory name for the Great-Russians in Ukrainian

I had rather a mawkish idea about Mr Velš. I had never been in his house during his lifetime, but whenever I wondered how he might look at home, the picture was always the same. Mr Velš was sitting at the table without a hat but in his apron; in front of him was a plate of steaming soup, he was resting his elbow on the table, and in his hand he held a heaped-up spoon halfway between the plate and his smiling mouth; there he sat as though he were carved out of wood with his spoon motionless. It was a silly fancy, I know.

But at the time when our story begins (4 o'clock in the afternoon of 3 May, 184—) Mr Velš was no longer alive. He was lying over the shop; on the first floor, in his own best bedroom, in a beautiful coffin. The lid had not yet been closed—and in death Mr. Velš, with eyes closed, was still smiling.

The funeral had been fixed for 4 o'clock. The hearse, the "tasselled" one, was already standing in the square before the house. The citizen sharpshooters' company and band were also there.

The best bedroom was almost full, local bigwigs all of them. Everybody knew that the parish priest of St Nicholas and his assistants would arrive a bit late, it being the custom to show proper respect to your neighbour, so that it might not be said that he was being hurried out of his own house. It was close in the room. The afternoon sun beat in and was reflected in the tall mirrors, the big wax candles round the coffin burned with a smoky, yellow light; the hot air was saturated with the heavy smell from the candles, the smell of the freshly stained black coffin and the chips of wood under the corpse, and perhaps, too, the smell from the corpse. All was quiet, and people spoke in whispers. There was no weeping, for Mr Velš had not left any close relatives; and more distant ones always say: "If only I could have a proper cry, but I can't wring any tears out."

"Yes, yes, it is all the worse then."

Then Mrs Ruska entered the room. She was the widow of the late Mr. Rus, who kept the restaurant in the Gráf gardens where the finest military balls were held. As it really doesn't affect anybody in any way, I may mention *en passant* the story which was current about Mrs Ruska's becoming a widow. At that time every artillery regiment had its own company of bombardiers, young rosy-faced fellows, all blood and milk. Mr Rus was said to have a real hatred for that company; it was something to do with his wife, they said, and he once got a real bashing because of it. But, as I have said, it doesn't affect anybody. Mrs. Ruska had been eating

her bread of widowhood for twenty-five years by then; she was childless and lived in her own house in the Selo market, and if anybody had asked her what she found to do, the answer would have been "Going to funerals"

Mrs Ruska pushed her way to the coffin. She was a woman of fifty, but was distinguished looking and of more than average height. A black lace mantilla fell over her shoulders, and a black cap trimmed with apple-green ribbons framed her shapely, straightforward face. Her brown eyes looked down at the dead man. A spasm passed over her face, her lips began to tremble and tears flooded her eyes. She sobbed heavily.

She quickly wiped her eyes and mouth with a white handkerchief and then looked at her neighbours to the right and left. On her left stood Mrs Hirt, the tallow merchant's wife, reading the prayers in her prayer book. On her right stood a nicely dressed girl, whom Mrs. Ruska did not know; if, as was to be presumed, she was from Prague, she must be from somewhere across the water. She addressed her, in German of course, because the Malá Strana was at that time far behind Prague in the development of the national consciousness.

"God give him everlasting glory," said Mrs. Ruska. "There he lies smiling as though he were alive," and she again wiped away the rush of tears. "He has gone and left us behind—and left all his wealth behind, too. Death is a robber."

The stranger did not answer.

"Once, too, I was at a Jewish funeral," Mrs. Ruska continued in a hushed voice, "but that isn't nice. All the looking glasses are covered up, so that you can't see the corpse, turn which way you will. It's nicer like this, to be able to have a good view from all sides of the corpse in the coffin, and I should have said *that* coffin cost twenty pounds, if it cost a penny; it's a beauty. But he was worth it all right; and doesn't he seem to be smiling at us from that mirror? Death has not changed him one atom, except that it has pulled him out a bit—he is as he was in life, isn't he?"

"I did not know Mr. Velš when he was alive," said the stranger.

"Didn't you? Oh, I knew him well. Before he was married even, and I knew his wife before her marriage, too. God rest her soul! I can see her on her marriage day as though it were today—she had been crying from the break of day—fancy now, crying a whole day after having been intimate with a man for the last nine years! Silly, isn't it? Nine years he had waited for her, though he would rather have waited nine times nine. That's what she was!

I tell you, she was dreadful. Fancied herself cleverer and handsomer than everyone! No one could manage a house as she could! She would bargain for an hour over a farthing at the market, and on washing day she would begrudge the poor charwoman a bucket of water, and her maids never got enough to eat. And Velš had a bath, too! I had two girls from their house and so I know all about it. He didn't have a moment's peace. They say that he kept decent only because he was afraid of her and that he didn't answer her back only to enrage her the more. You know, she was what they call romantic and liked to have all the world's pity. She was for ever complaining how her husband tortured her. If he had poisoned her in his vexation, she would have been glad, and if he had hanged himself, she would have been glad, too, for then at least the world would have pitied her."

Mrs. Ruska turned again to her unknown neighbour. But she was no longer there. In her enthusiasm Mrs. Ruska had not noticed that the girl had got redder and redder in the face and had moved away in the middle of the diatribe. She was now at the back of the room talking to the thin Mr. Uhmühl, an official in the State accountancy department and a relative of Mr. Velš.

Mrs. Ruska had another look at the dead man's face. Her lips again began to twitch and a tear spurted from her eye.

"Poor man," she said quite loudly to Mrs. Hirt, "but there is God's punishment for everything. After all, we must allow that he wasn't a man of good life. He might have married poor Tonda who did have a child by him, when all is said and done."

"So you flew here, eh, on your broomstick?" said someone in a loud voice at her back, and a man's bony hand clutched her. The tone of the voice made everybody jump, and all eyes were turned on Mrs. Ruska and Mr. Uhmühl who had planted himself before her. He signed with his hand to the door, and in his hoarse but penetrating voice uttered the command "Out you go!"

"What is the matter?" This was from the other Mr. Uhmühl, who was at the door. He was the police commissioner of the Malá Strana and was nothing more nor less than a skeleton, as thin as his brother.

"The old witch has found her way here and is maligning the dead. She has a tongue like a sword."

"Out with her then, bag and baggage!"

"That is what she does at every funeral," was heard from all sides.

"She has made a row even at the grave side before now."

"Quick, now," ordered the commissioner in the anteroom, for just then the priest and chaplains were passing

Then he led her to the stairs Mrs Ruska tried to let off a few more words, but the commissioner conducted her inexorably down and out of the house. Then he signed to a policeman

"Take this woman to her lodging to stop her from causing a scandal at a funeral"

Mrs Ruska was as red as a peony and did not know what was happening

"A scandal—and so beautiful a funeral!" the words went booming over the square.

The Messrs Uhmühl, sons of Mr. Uhmel, the town-clerk, and the grandsons of Mr Uměl, the dyer, were, to be sure, very strict gentlemen And on that day the inhabitants of the Malá Strana turned up their noses at Mrs Ruska, and if Malá Strana had been the big world—a thing that would have pleased every good patriot—their scorn would have been world-wide

On the next day Mrs Ruska was sent round to the police commissioner's office in Bridge Street.

Things were always lively there. In the summer, when the proceedings were conducted with open windows, you could hear the goings-on right down the street. In those days, you were put through it properly; there wasn't any of that politeness which of course is the pride of all the police proceedings today. Joe, the harp-player, and a noted revolutionary of the district, would often stand on the pavement below the windows, and when any of us young fellows went past and looked at him, Joe would wink, and with an upward jerk of his thumb and a quiet grin would say "They're barking." I hope that he meant no disrespect and that he was only searching for the most graphic expression

So, in mantilla and cap trimmed with green ribbons, Mrs Ruska was standing on the afternoon of the fourth of May in the year 184— in front of the stern commissioner.

She was cowed, her eyes were downcast and she made no reply. And when the official had finished a severe speech with the words: "Never dare go again to any funeral as long as you live. And now you may go," off she went.

But he might as well have forbidden her to die as stop her going to funerals

When she left the police station, the commissioner looked at a junior official and said with a smile: "She can't help it. She is like a saw—that must cut up anything put in front of it."

"She ought to pay a contribution for the deaf and dumb!" said the clerk

They both laughed, and their good temper was restored.

But Mrs Ruska could not get back her good humour for a long time. At last, however, she recovered it.

Some six months later, she removed and took a lodging just by the Oujezd gate. Every funeral had to pass by there, and every time one passed, good Mrs Ruska went and stood outside her house and wept right heartily.

## HASSAN-CHAUSH.

From the Serbo-Croat of GREGORY BOŽOVIĆ.

*Translated by* L. F. EDWARDS.

EVEN today the details of the terrible death of the Voivode Angelko and his eleven followers at the village of Četirac are not fully known. It is only known that their guide either lost his way or betrayed them. Yet the fame of the encounter spread thence like a peal of thunder throughout all Serbia, especially among us of the frontier stations, Vranja and Ristovac. We who lived at Ristovac were particularly stirred, as we had seen the heroes and helped them to cross the border to their death. Perhaps I myself take most of the blame, since I, of my own free will, recommended them a route and selected the moment when they should advance into the heart of Turkish territory.

At that time I was still a young man, and for that reason very sensitive. Those were the days of our first inroads into Macedonia, those enterprises designed to prove to Belgrade and the whole world that we also had our rights in that countryside. Because of that, you will believe me when I say that for two days I never tasted a mouthful, or slept a wink for three solid nights. Although I was an official and our Government agent, and although Ristovac was our most vulnerable point of entry, I spent those three days indifferently, letting the trains through without searching them, caring not a jot if the Bulgarian Nedkov or the Austrian Miller von Bogtoj were hurrying through to their capitals to rejoice them with the news of our recent defeat.

At the end of the third day, when both trains, to Belgrade and to Skoplje, had gone, I went on foot across the bridge to

Zibevce I took Vuk, the policeman, with me so that his company might relieve my heaviness of soul. I wanted to see what the Turks were doing, how they were rejoicing and celebrating their victory; I wanted to start a fight, to kill somebody with Vuk's help, so that war should break out at once and the whole affair come to a head. Yet it was not only a question of our profound sadness for the dead Voivode or the affront to our national pride or, in my own case, that I had with my own hands started this unfortunate chain of events. No. After all it was only a question of some petty guerilla band and its raid on one side or other of the Vardar. Even in Belgrade there were many influential persons to whom the whole affair seemed a frontier incident of very little account.

People have told me that the Turks are old rogues. I do not say so. I maintain that their wisdom is old and well-established and that they are the true successors of the Byzantine power. They know how to be masters and how to retain their dignity. And when necessary they can be very kindly. Now, just as if nothing had happened, I was welcomed with good fellowship and offered coffee and sweet-scented Kavalla tobacco, as though it had been the feast of Bairam.

"Are all well at home, Effendi?"

"Yes, quite well."

"Is the Prefect of Vranja in good health?"

"Yes, in good health, Effendi."

"It's a fine day today, isn't it, thank God?"

"Yes, it is fine," I answered, knowing such questions well, and how every Turkish official asks them when he does not want to talk of other things.

I left Vuk there and went into the inn near by. Here to my great good fortune there was no one besides the inn-keeper, save my old and tried friend Hassan-Chaush from Bilač, who had been drinking, who knows how long, bottle after bottle. He greeted me almost without a word, but got up and bowed deeply and respectfully, as only a Turk knows how to one whom he loves and honours.

Hassan-Chaush was a marvellous mixture of races: it was true he was a Turk, perhaps equally true that he was Albanian or Serb. He spoke all three languages fluently, though his Serbian was interlarded with many Turkish words. But Turkish he had mastered perfectly, and I was very glad to talk to him in that language, especially as it gave me practice. In his youth he had

served eight years with the army in Anatolia, and there he had learnt the language and acquired Turkish habits

From Anatolia he had returned with the rank of Sergeant and had entered the frontier force, receiving a position as block-house commander near Bilač. So it was that I came to know him. When he was getting on in years, he received his discharge and a small pension and went to his village to lead a peaceful life. He was tall and strong, and it fitted him exactly to be addressed by the title of Aga. Generally speaking, he was even-tempered, as only a Turk can be when he is born a good man. He was as strictly true to his word and his code of honour as any Albanian of the Malisor country. And he had a certain gentleness in his face and, without doubt, in his soul, such as can only be found among the Serbs of the country on this side of the Morava. It was said that he was a dangerous man when angered, but to his peasants he was always just and pleasant. No tyrant, he was not what they call there a "cadger," did not run after the women in his villages, and would address the peasants as "son." Because of all this I valued his friendship and kept in touch with him, taking care that my friendliness should not embarrass him when he was in the service, and later on in the eyes of his village and the Turkish authorities.

Today we spoke only Turkish.

"Come, sit by me, Effendi. We will drink something. Some brandy, eh?"

"Yes, brandy, Hassan Aga."

"A small glass?"

"Please."

"Sit down, my friend. There, near me; no, nearer. It is now three days since I have been drinking brandy, and yet I cannot drink enough . . ."

I looked at him with meaning, and he turned towards me in a deeply friendly way, somehow compassionately. He re-crossed his legs and motioned me nearer.

"Have you been across the border these last few days?"

"No, I haven't."

"Do you know, then?" he asked fiercely, almost ready to weep.

"I know," I answered, realising of what he was speaking.

"But not all . . . much you do not know . . . ah, my friend . . . but drink a glass with me, brace yourself to hear what I have to say . . ."



Then he began whispering quietly; not so much to tell the story as to embroider it, almost without pausing, save when he moistened his lips with brandy or reminded the inn-keeper to fill up our glasses . . .

"These Turks are either as foolish as cattle or heartless as hangmen. They are not able to feel the beauty of heroism and sacrifice. He only is a true hero who sees and feels this and does not belittle the honour of another. A hero is a hero, no matter who he be. He is a hero for everyone who accounts himself a man, be he Serb, Turk, Albanian or Tartar. That must be understood. God, who sends such people into the world, knows this, and how should not I, Hassan-Chaush from Bilač?" And, believe me, had he not acted in this way, had he not always honoured men of honour and heroism, God would not have helped him to live to an honoured and respected old age, even after the province had been reconquered from the Turks. "It is not necessary to mourn for the Voivode Angelko, save only that a brave man is dead!" A Serb should be proud of his death. One must be a man to see this and understand it. Eh! Eh!"

When the Voivode and his band were recognised, he was quickly surrounded by soldiers and irregulars. Through the Moslem villages an uproar began as if a whole army had crossed the border. Old and young, everyone who could carry arms, rushed madly to Četirac, howling as if they were following the standard of the Prophet. The mass of people quickly became a disorganised and maddened mob, who knew no other thought than to drink infidel blood. They hurried after one another to where the sound of rifle-fire and bomb-throwing could be heard, shouting wildly as they went:

"Run, the Infidel has attacked us! Whoever is a Turk come and fight for the faith of Islam. The Infidel has struck!"

People do not know what power such an appeal has, and how from a Mohammedan crowd arises a single soul, terribly brave, blindly hurrying onward, bloodthirsty as a beast. It rushes to fire and sword and then is oblivious to everything. He, Hassan-Chaush, went too, with his village. In fact he immediately placed himself at their head. He was a Turk and he was a Moslem, and could not resist the impulse to join his brothers to meet the enemies of his country and of his hearth. He went willingly, and like a young man. He had often fought with Albanians and with the Bedouin in Arabia. And he knew his own worth. For this reason he meant to put himself in the front rank at once, in order to take

command and teach these simple peasants, without experience in war, not to sacrifice themselves madly. He would show them that day that no true blows are struck save an old man strikes them. For he thought that there at Četirac a great force had struck suddenly, hoping to force their way through to Skoplje.

In the meantime, piercing the ring of Askaris and irregulars around the slope where the struggle was going on, he saw before him a terrible picture. The besiegers were a mighty phalanx, innumerable as the trees of a forest, who kept up a terrible shouting and poured an incessant fire on the surrounded men. The dead bodies of the guerilla band were scattered on the grassy slope; only two remained living. Both were lying on the ground, firing irregularly. He felt at once that they were running short of ammunition and that the end was near. Suddenly an awful shriek was heard; one of the two fighters leapt up from the ground, whirled round, and fell full length. At this the other man knelt on one knee and, picking up a bomb, looked straight at the enemy as if shooting at them with his eyes and, with a drawn unearthly smile such as men only smile when they wish to die manfully:

"Strike, I am the Voivode Angjelko!"

"Strike!"—the order was heard and a fusillade broke out; yet no one moved forward.

He, Hassan-Chaush, swore by everything he held holiest in the world that he himself would have gone forward to try his fortune and measure himself with this hero, had the Turks obeyed his order to cease fire. But they did not, and his hands fell to his side. He rested his rifle on the ground, leaned on it and felt ashamed for himself, for the Turks and for his kingdom. So many men against one. Such a crowd, devoid of any sort of reason, raging as the sea when it breaks on the shore, yet it could not frighten one man and only swayed to and fro, trying to determine in which direction the prisoner was going to throw his bomb. And then something in Chaush's soul seemed to divide. He was no longer in sympathy with his own people, but with him who, so heroically, with hand uplifted, looked at them as though from an impregnable fortress. He grieved sincerely that such a man should be overcome in such an unequal fight.

The Turks did not slacken fire, but began to shout to the Serb to surrender. Even now he wondered how so great a hail of bullets did not kill that wonderful man. The Voivode was quite near, and he could see his face. And he looked at him, almost in a brotherly manner, encouraging him in his soul. Ah, one must believe that!

Heroes can recognise one another by their eyes. So he felt that the Voivode recognised him, Hassan Aga, and knew quite well what he was thinking. In a moment he had thrown into the crowd all three remaining bombs, one after the other, leapt to his feet, seized his bayonet and cried out, "See, you Turks, how a Serbian Voivode dies . . ."

\*        •        \*        \*        '        \*

You can well believe with what emotion I listened to Hassan's tale, since up to that time I knew nothing of the fight. I lifted my eyes to see if I could read how much truth there was in his face. The picture before me was this. Hassan-Chaush had his right hand lifted to his throat as if holding a knife, his lips were parted in unspoken words and the tears were coursing down his pale face.

"It was so. See, Effendi, how your Voivode cut his throat before all of us, like a Ghazi. O Lord, grant to him according to his faith, that in the next world he may have an eternal place among the heroes! . . ."

It was some time before we recovered ourselves. Proud as I was that our Voivode had fallen so heroically, even so I admired my friend for his goodness and his wonderful outlook on such men. He stood up to go and, taking from beside him a waxen candle wrapped in paper, he said to me:

"Every evening I come here and buy a candle from Koca. It is here, see! And when twilight falls, I go to the place where the Voivode was killed. There I light a candle for his soul, according to his faith. Surely neither mother nor son can come and do this for him? Surely none of you could do it? I can and I do. It is no sin to me to serve and honour such a heroic soul. I hope that God and his saints, both yours and mine, love such a man. You see, I am that sort of Turk. When one is a hero, it is a sin not to honour a hero! . . ."

So in very truth spoke Hassan-Chaush some years ago. and it would be a shame to me also if I did not respect him for it even now.

## POETRY

## FAREWELL.

*Translated from the Russian of A. S. PUSHKIN*

by MAUD F. JERROLD

FOR the last time I dare to hold thee  
 Within my mind in close caress;  
 To wake a dream of strength I fold thee,  
 — Recall thy love, as I behold thee  
 With weary, utter helplessness

How the years change as they pass over!  
 Time changes all and changes us.  
 Already for thy poet-lover  
 Thou stand'st where funeral shadows cover,  
 And he for thee is faded thus.

O far-off Love, to whom is given  
 The last farewell my heart has sent;  
 Take as a widowed wife, or even  
 As friend that clings to friend, ere driven  
 Forth to his place of banishment.

## THE MUSE.

*Translated from the Russian of A. S. PUSHKIN*

by MAUD F. JERROLD.

SHE loved me in my youth; she put  
 Within my hand a seven-toned flute;  
 She looked and listened with a smile,  
 As to the empty reed the while  
 My trembling fingers did I set  
 And strove to wake some sound from it.  
 The echoing tones I learnt to fire  
 With such high hymns as gods inspire,  
 Or shepherds' peaceful pastorals.  
 Where from the oak the shadow falls,  
 From morn till eve I sought the glade  
 To meet the fair mysterious maid,  
 And, resting on the silent sward,

I waited for the sure reward  
Her curls lay heavy on her brow,  
She took the pipe from me, and lo !  
With breath divine the sweet notes swell  
And cast on me their holy spell.

## VERSES.

*Translated from the Russian of A. S. PUSHKIN*

by MAUD F. JERROLD.

THE heavy clouds at length are scattering  
O Star of sorrow, Star of evening,  
Thy ray has silvered the fast-fading plain,  
The quiet gulf, the black rocks of the main.  
I love thy feeble light in the far heaven,  
It wakes old thoughts now unto slumber given  
Have I not seen thee rise, remembered Star,  
Across the peaceful land where all things are  
Dear to the heart, where poplars stand in state  
Along the vale, and myrtles delicate,  
And gloomy cypresses, and evermore  
The south winds sing Along the hills and shore,  
Full of sweet thoughts, in dreamy idleness,  
In olden days my feet were wont to press.

## SPRING.

*Translated from the Russian of ALEXIS TOLSTOY*

by MAUD F. JERROLD

SEE, the last snow has melted from the fields,  
And now warm vapours from the ground arise ;  
The water-lily her blue blossom yields,  
The cranes are heard as each to other cries.

To the young trees a verdant mist doth cling,  
Impatiently they wait for the warm rain ;  
All things are kindled by the breath of spring,  
And all awake to love and song again.

Clear and transparent is the sky at morn,  
 And shining stars at night are clear no less—  
 Why then within your soul is darkness born,  
 And in your heart such load of heaviness ?

Your sorrow, O my friend, I understand,  
 And know why grief your life is darkening  
 If only you might reach your native land,  
 You would forego the pageant of the spring.

### AUTUMN

*Translated from the Russian of IVAN TURGENEV*  
 by MAUD F. JERROLD.

O how I love the look funereal  
 Of autumn. On a still and sombre day  
 Into the forest oft I make my way,  
 And sitting there allow my eyes to stray  
 O'er the dark pine-tops and the skies so pale.

I love to bite the bitter leaves, and he  
 With idle smile, stretching myself at ease,  
 And occupy my mind with fantasies,  
 And hear the woodpecker's thin whistling cry.

Now all the grass is withered up, and now  
 A chilly shimmer overspreads the whole ;  
 And to a leisured melancholy, slow  
 And silent, I abandon all my soul.

What do I not recall? What happenings  
 Do not return in dreams to visit me ?  
 The pine-trees bow themselves like living things,  
 And cease not from their mournful minstrelsy.

The dark, entangled branches creak and swing  
 With an impatient sound, and suddenly  
 Like flight of mighty birds upon the wing,  
 The strong wind rises and comes rushing by.

## VERSES.

*Translated from the Russian of N. M. MINSKY*

by SIR DONALD MACALISTER.

## I

HE, in his youth, believed in God devoutly,  
 But, grown to manhood, many books he read,  
 His Maker spurned, set Reason up instead,  
 And, prayerless now, confronted Heaven stoutly.

Prayerless, his mother to her grave he bore,  
 But, when his mate fell ill—that was more serious.  
 Seven days and nights she fevered, grew delirious,  
 Then, the dread hour of crisis at the door. . . .

The time was deepest night . . . 'twas life or death.  
 The patient lay unmoving, scarce drew breath;  
 He fell prone suddenly, as when a child,  
 Calling on Heaven, with sobs and tears of grief.  
 And Heaven heard his cries, and hearing smiled  
 At man's belief, and at his unbelief.

## II.

If I am still here on the first day of May,  
                   If I should win through,  
 Not caring for aught that the sentries may say,  
 I'll go out and gather May-lilies for you—  
 In woods where the trees are all scattered with shot,  
 And graves newly-made are already forgot—  
                   I'll gather for you.

If I am still here in the heat of July,  
                   If I should win through,  
 I'll out, never fearing the bullets that fly,  
 To the fields, and I'll gather red poppies for you—  
 Wild poppies that grow on the red battle-plain,  
 Red poppies that drunk up the blood of the slain—  
                   I'll gather for you.

If I am still here when the autumn comes on,  
     If I should win through,  
 Blue cockle, that lasts when the others are gone,  
 In waste No-man's land I will gather for you  
 White, red and blue--will stand for three pledges I take,  
 To be pure, to endure, and to trust--for your sake,  
     If I should win through.

EUPHEMIA <sup>1</sup>

*Translated from the Serbian of MILAN RAKIĆ by MILUTIN KRUNIĆ  
 AND DOROTHEA PRALL RADIN.*

EUPHEMIA, the daughter of Drama's king and ruler,  
 Queen-wife to high Uglesha, solitary, old,  
 Far from former splendour, in the cloister's twilight,  
 Weaves an altar mystery in threads of silk and gold.

Around her all is bleeding, her people choke and strangle,  
 Kings and nations perish, joy and power depart.  
 Hid away and helpless, she has her needle only  
 To utter all the anguish of her noble heart.

Centuries have vanished, the world has half forgotten  
 The land that still is tortured as ages long ago,  
 But thou, high-hearted woman, thy prophetic bosom  
 Throbbled with a foreknowledge of all the pain we know.

In the awful hours of our country's passion  
 When under blackened heavens bloody rivers run,  
 I think of thee, great Serbian, and the house that bore thee,  
 Thou who clothed thy royalty in garments of a nun.

And still I feel thy presence moving down the ages,  
 Changeless as our ancient fate ever onward creeping,  
 And above the nation going out in darkness  
 Still I hear the voice of thy lamenting and thy weeping.

<sup>1</sup> "Simonida," a poem by the same author, was published in a translation of R. W. Seton-Watson, in *Slavonic Review*, No. 17, p. 415.



## THE DESERTED CHURCH.

*Translated from the Serbian of MILAN RAKIĆ by MILUTIN KRUNIĆ  
and DOROTHEA PRAIL RADIN*

THE ancient picture stands there, Christ the crucified  
Along his piercèd side a cruel scarlet stain,  
The patient lips that unto death would not complain  
Are lifeless now and dead, the eyes still open wide.

A beaten silver halo crowns him deified;  
About his neck hang coins, a precious minted chain.  
Offered long since in adoration of his pain,  
A Debran artist wrought the frame in humble pride.

Thus Christ in the deserted church still stands and gazes  
While night steals slowly onward with its black alarms  
And birds of darkness from their unclean crannies pour.

And preying vampires stream and wind in giddy mazes.  
Deserted, awful, still he spreads his outstretched arms,  
Forever waiting for the flock that is no more.

## KASPROWICZ.<sup>1</sup>

I HAVE chosen Kasprowicz as the first of a series of the leading literary figures of 20th-century Poland not because he is the most easily accessible, that he certainly is not. Neither do I choose him because of his popularity, he is not a popular poet. It would be also impossible to argue that he was always faultless as an artist. But he can be considered among the first of the poets of his generation by the strain of his spiritual energy and by the grandeur of his poetic career.

The outstanding characteristic of Kasprowicz's work is its moral vigour. As a young man of 25, at the very awakening of his poetical self-consciousness, he had saluted life with all its contradictions. Peace and struggle, victory and defeat, faith and doubt, joy and sorrow, blessings and curses, reality and illusion. He welcomed them all passionately. And this welcome was a true expression of his inmost self and a prophetic announcement of his future. Throughout his life every spiritual experience will be intense with him, every feeling eager. There will be many contrasts in what he will proclaim, there will scarcely be any lukewarm emotion in it. If there is no "brimming bowl," let there be for him a "bottomless abyss", if there is no "harmony of sounds," let there be a "demonic dissonance". He seems to see everything in the superlative, and only feelings of the highest tension seem to him to be worthy of noticing. At the end of his life, after tremendous interior toil and combat, he reached his long-desired quiet "sky-blue," "profound" quiet, a quiet that armed him with certainty and gave a clear light to his eyes, but even then he would say, not without a certain pride, that at the heart of his quiet the fire of holy wars was burning still. And now when he prays we seem to hear again his youthful supplications, only transformed by his rich experience and by the craft of his mature art into lyric masterpieces. He implores God to reign over his heart, although he knows that God's presence can manifest itself in calms as in thunders, in enjoyment as in renouncement. The end of the poet's road reminds us then of its beginning. It does not matter so much whether life holds more radiance than gloom, more satiation than sacrifice, if only there be a fullness of one of them.

<sup>1</sup> A lecture delivered in the School of Slavonic and East European Studies on 4 February, 1931

Another essential characteristic of Kasprowicz's poetical work is its continuity. There was something strikingly persevering and stubborn in him. Certain themes were continually recurring in his poems throughout the forty years of his literary activity. Certain motifs seem literally to have haunted him. When reading his work we meet them again and again. And yet we never have the impression of something simply being repeated, of a replica being made for an artistic satisfaction alone. Kasprowicz never stayed still. Every poem he wrote marked a stage on his way, every poetical statement he made was a sort of conquest. His questions recurred, but his answers were always new, and if in the end they did not satisfy the poet, he revised them with a fuller mind. This continuity led one of Kasprowicz's critics to declare that he would like nothing better than to see his works edited in one volume bearing no other title than "Kasprowicz."

But it is not the unity of his work, it is its completeness which is the most striking feature of his poetic life. In spite of the genuine vehemence of his nature, the development of his personality was healthily balanced by the development of his artistic craftsmanship. It was at the very moment when he reached the full content of his comprehensive wisdom that his art crystallised in the most perfect poems he ever wrote.

It is of added interest that Kasprowicz's poetical work is closely connected with his personal life, for there are elements in his personal life which made him particularly representative of his day.

It is universally known that the civilisation of the old Poland was created by the nobility. It is true that this class was in Poland more numerous than in many other countries and comprised a number of different economic groups, but the fact remains that it was the only class possessing the full rights of citizenship. Protests against such an organisation of society were heard from the beginnings of the 18th century and in the famous constitution of 1791, Poland atoned for the long-standing injustice against one class at least, that of the townsmen. But no change was made in the status of the peasants; they remained in servitude in Poland as in many other European countries. Then came the partitions, and though many patriots urged that the liberation of the peasants was a cause inevitably bound up with the liberation of Poland, nonetheless Poland was never able of herself to declare the freedom of her peasants. In this she was forestalled by the edicts of the three Empires which ruled her. It was one of the most tragic moments of her history, when her three oppressive masters assumed the rôle

of benefactors over a class of the community which had been oppressed in a free Poland

The question arose, what will the peasants become, will they join the old cultural tradition, which was that of the nobility? Or will they despise that tradition and go a way of their own? Would the Polish civilisation be united as it had been up to that day, or would it be split asunder? Kasprowicz's life was one of the unmistakable and symbolic answers to these questions, for Kasprowicz was the first peasant among the great figures of Polish literature. For the sake of accuracy it must be added that Polish literary history had seen before one peasant in its annals. That was long ago, at the beginning of the 16th century. This peasant was Clemens Janitius. Educated by a bishop of Poznań, he became one of the great Latinists of his day, and by his elegiac poems even won a crown of laurels at the papal court. But since that time the great names in Polish literature are chiefly those of noblemen; only very occasionally do we meet a townsman. The appearance of Kasprowicz in Polish poetry—and he appeared in it as a peasant conscious of his class and connected with it by his feelings and his instincts—was a beginning of something new. New racial energies were to be tested. And Kasprowicz's work was a positive answer.

He was born in 1860 in a family of small farmers in Kujavia, in that part of Poland which was under the German domination. The early childhood of the future poet and scholar was spent in tending geese and cattle on his native pastures. But he was the eldest son, and his parents, poor though they were, made efforts to give him an education. He passed through the elementary school in his village and was sent to the secondary school in the town of Inowrocław. The life in his home was by no means easy, but that in the school was perhaps still harder. From those early days the poet learnt what the struggle for existence was. And it was in those school-days that he felt for the first time a vocation for poetry. In his childish verses he described the beauties of nature around him and bewailed the sufferings of the poor village people. A patriotic consciousness also was soon awakened in him by books of the old poets and by historic memories of which his province was full. In that period, too, he had the first important conflict in his life: it was with his school authorities, who were ruthless in their Germanising policy. As a result, Kasprowicz was compelled to leave. He attended for short periods at two or three other schools, and only four years afterwards, when he was already 24, did he get his matriculation certificate. In his wanderings he spent a certain

time in Silesia, and that province, which had been outside the Polish State since the 14th century but had preserved the language and the spirit of Poland, strongly influenced his national feelings.

Next we see him in the German Universities of Leipzig and Breslau. He eagerly attended public lectures, but had no money to register for regular courses. He met at that time some socialist leaders from Poland, and took part in the Polish workers' movement in Silesia. In his double character as a socialist and as a Pole, he was locked up for six months in the Breslau gaol. He had time to meditate both on the misery of working people and on the oppression of the nation. Soon afterwards he settled in Lwów. In this town he was to spend the greater part of his life. It was the typical existence of a journalist and literary translator. It was punctuated by longer travels to the Polish mountains, to Switzerland and to Italy. All these travels gave him strong impressions, the influence of which is to be traced in his works. Mountains especially became necessary to him. In his later years he even bought a small farmhouse beneath the Polish Tatra and used to spend there every holiday that he had. Under the shadow of these mountains the greatest of his poems were written.

Just as the influence of nature was so strong upon him, so also was that of literature, and his literary interests can be judged by his choice in translations. He translated several of the comedies and tragedies of Shakespeare, Marlowe's *Doctor Faustus*, Coleridge's *Ancient Mariner*, Byron's *Childe Harold*, several poems of Shelley, Keats' *Hyperion*, Browning's *Pippa Passes*, W. B. Yeats' *Countess Cathleen*; in later years he turned to classics and produced a complete translation of Aeschylus and Euripides. He undertook an anthology of English poets from Chaucer to Robert Bridges. And there were other translations besides, many of them requiring not only literary skill and poetic insight, but also study and research. The vast knowledge displayed in his writings induced the University of Lwów to offer him a Chair of Literature. He occupied this post until the last year of his life. He died in 1926 at his peasant house in the mountains.

His life was filled with work, and his output was astonishing in its quantity. It did not diminish even in the period when Kasprowicz had to pass through a poignant personal drama, the parting with his first wife. And it must be added that his interests were not limited to the artistic, let alone to literary matters. He was concerned with the whole life of the community. He was a member of a political party (the National Democrats), and for years was

active on its administrative committee. He gave public lectures. He rarely refused any work that was asked of him for the common cause. He tried even to be a humorist (which was most contrary to his nature) when during the war it was difficult to express certain political principles in any other way. It was a life beset with obstacles, but he knew how to surmount them, it was full of sufferings, but he knew how to suffer without being crushed. His aims were difficult, but by his determination he achieved many of them. By his energy, by the width of his outlook and interest he reached a high measure as a man.

His literary work is of different kinds. There are short epic poems from the lives of the people; there are realistic dramas (with country people as heroes), plays in the manner of medieval mysteries; there are long philosophical poems, there are ballads, there are many varieties of personal lyric poems and hymns. Strange as it may seem for so vehement an individuality, he even wrote many occasional poems, on different contemporary events, such as anniversary celebrations or the unveiling of new monuments, as if he were a kind of poet laureate. These poems are not among his best, but for all that there is no discord between them and the rest of his work. It was his peculiarity that, as one of his critics observed, he knew how to express himself entirely in every fragment he wrote.

For whatever was the direct subject of his work, he never lost sight of the alpha and omega of existence. Cosmogony and eschatology were the most familiar domains of his imagination. Life and Death, Creation and the Creator, Good and Evil, the Will and Destiny: these were his essential themes.

The riddle over which his poetry incessantly lingers is the riddle of existence itself. His first solutions were formed in the days when materialistic monism prevailed. But he very soon rejected materialism. We see him at an early date as a philosophical disciple of Shelley. He is also attracted by the Indians. These masters gave him a strong conviction of an intrinsic unity between all beings. And this conviction suited his own instinct very well. When pining for a rustling of leaves in a wood, he would explain to himself that his soul and the soul of the wood were twins. Life was for him "the Eternal One." But he was no pantheist any more than he was a materialist. His God is immanent as well as transcendent. And there is always a deep sense of mystery in his poetry about the fundamental issues. "He *was*, and so were we all, in the beginning"; this is the characteristic first line of one of his great odes. But how strange, how inconceivable in the eyes of this unitarian

seer is the contrasting diversity and multitude of created beings ! How mysteriously dramatic is the distance between God and Man ; this distance of which another ode, the hero of which is St. Francis of Assisi, says " I long awaited the eternal Word—although it was in myself and in the past ! " It might be said—in the technical vocabulary of philosophy—that a great part of Kasprowicz's poetry is the poetry of the antinomies of monism

These antinomies are further strengthened and sharpened by the tormenting riddle of the existence of Evil. Kasprowicz faced this riddle in the very earliest of his works, in short poetic tales depicting the sufferings of those village people who are living " in the night, without joy, burdened with cares." Another domain of his experience of Evil was the mournful existence of his injured country. These were the objects of his first youthful indignation and compassion.

In the course of time Evil looms up before Kasprowicz as more powerful and more widespread. Moreover, he sees now that its reign has foundations in the very order of things itself. Even Love is an agent of Evil. Even suffering Man is filled with Evil. The unhappy multitudes which he pitied so deeply now reveal to him their paltry meanness. And he curses them now in fierce and terrible words :

Thou wert my idol once, O Multitude !  
Thou cam'st O human reptile, unto me,  
With mark of yoke upon thy bended neck,  
And my soul cursed thy tyrants. It is thou,  
Foe of the spirit, who hast trodden down  
With leaden foot the flowers sown by God.<sup>2</sup>

Thus spoke the poet who not very long before had apostrophised his suffering people as " saints " And it was not the proud isolation of an æsthete. It was the deep dismay of a man who had a strong moral sense and who felt a strong kinship with the multitude. He isolates himself like a hermit in his cell, for he fears that he may see in the eyes of his fellow-men the mirrored image of his own weakness and guilt

What is the source of Evil? How can the existence of Evil be reconciled with the fundamental unity of the cosmos? What can Man do against it? What hope is there for his efforts? From the time of his very first poems Kasprowicz was seeking the answers to these questions. Monistic though his youthful philosophy was, he

<sup>2</sup> Translated by Prof R. Dyboski.

was very early compelled to admit some temporary elements of duality in the world: he spoke of the dark elements which it was a general human duty to fight. But in his mature years he is overwhelmed with doubts. Every struggle with Evil seems hopeless. The word "despondency" recurs more and more often. He begins to express a disbelief in the very possibility of the reign of Good and Justice in the world.

For a time it seemed that this despairing mood of the poet would be overcome by Love. And Love appears in Kasprowicz's lyrics of that period strong and passionate. It is represented as something defying death, giving the soul a feeling of harmony with Nature. It revives faith in goodness and kindles a new enthusiasm for great labours. But soon Love, too, proves deceptive. It even transforms Promethean energies into destructive forces. Demonic elements are active in its very heart. It is characteristic of this period of Kasprowicz's life that twice he made the biblical Salome the figure of Love.

Of course, there could not be such easy simplification. There were periods of vacillation and change. The poet contradicted himself several times quite consciously. He looked for something that would restore his hopes and justify his instinctive trust in life, but could find nothing. The horizon became gloomier and gloomier. A new cycle of his lyrical poems bears the expressive title *My Soul Descends into Darkness*. Kasprowicz is pitilessly consistent in it, and in this consistency more contradictory than ever. He blesses and glorifies every struggle in the maelstrom of life, every heroic effort to overcome the hideous world of chaos, ugliness and horror. But he confesses that he himself is now frightened and without courage. His complaints and protests mingle now with prayers for death. Not to be—there seems no other way of escaping this oppression of pain and injury. And what of the world? For the world as well, destruction seems to be the only possible issue. There is no happiness where there is life. Then: "Let the world perish—it was made to perish!"

And Kasprowicz, now a man of about 40, in the full development of his artistic gifts, writes a book of odes and hymns entitled: *To the Dying World*. It is something like a series of symbolic frescoes of more than life-size, reminiscent in the first place of contemporary symbolist and impressionist art by their technique, and of medieval "Visions of the Judgement" by their atmosphere. Suffering rules here, "powerful, almighty." We see a forest of crosses, on which are crucified the victims of injustice, of misery and of sin. Rivers



and seas are filled with blood. The intensity of the poet's feeling is perhaps most strongly marked in realistic descriptions of tortures and agonies. And there is no place of rest in this terrible world. Love, towards which man in his eternal exile looks with hope, is transformed to a "devouring flame" or to a "barren yearning". Peace has become a "blind and stony despair". Sin lives in the soul of man. Even the highest human ecstasies immediately degenerate into crime. Even the hope of the world, offers herself to Satan. These frightful sights lead the poet to appeal for judgment and for punishment. But (it was one of the articles in his creed) whatever happens under the vault of heaven has its source in God: It was God who created everything, then Evil is His creation also, then He is the cause of our universal despair, then the sentence that hangs over us has its origin in His guilt! How can we understand His indifference? How can we imagine this God who exalts Himself in the glory of creation when misery and suffering prevail on the earth? Is it possible that the world was called into being not by God, but by Satan? But why then is not Satan punished by God's thunder? Should we perhaps adore Satan and pray not to God, but to him, as did the "Soul exiled from Paradise" in Kasprowicz's mystery play, *On the Hill of Death*? Or is it better to wait for nothingness? "Let there be nothing!" So says Kasprowicz's transposition of the church hymn *Dies Irae*.

But in this labyrinth of sufferings, sins and riddles without solution, in this intricacy of contradictions—there is one path, a path which seems for the first time to be remarked by the poet on this vast landscape, it is the path of Christianity. Its fascination is to be observed in the imagery of the odes, and even in their titles. Moreover, it is evident in the very conception itself. It was the development of the poet's own thought, which made him summon God to suffer and to sorrow with Man. But this conception was the basis of the Christian faith. Among the paradoxes of Christianity this is the principal and fundamental one. "The Saviour . . . wept over you," so the hymn *Salve, Regina* reminds us. And over the Gehenna of guilt and punishment in the sombre *Dies Irae* hovers a great vision of the head encircled with a "crown of thorns." It is a vision of such torments as break the "breast of Doom."

It was not yet the acceptance of the faith, but it was the understanding of it and the recognition of its depth and sublimity. The prevailing mood of the poet is not faith but discord, and if there are prayers in his odes they are continually mixed with blasphemies and curses.

The same mood is reflected in another work by Kasprowicz, a strange prose book, entitled *On the Heroic Horse and a Decaying House*. What the odes had generalised in symbols, this book shows in a series of every-day scenes, described in a style in which journalistic brutality mingles with scoffing irony and sarcasm, only from time to time allowing the poet's bitter lyricism to become apparent. It is a reproduction of the same chaos of wickedness and pain, but stupidity and meanness are now recognised as important elements in it.

With regard to the human will the poet assumes now—and for the only time in his life—a completely fatalistic attitude, which is startling even after his despair. "Do not make any efforts," he says, "and quell your desire to resist." These words, of course, might have been expected also in his earlier writings, but then they would surely be joined with curses; now they are terribly positive. But this is the nadir of despondency. In the soul of the poet there was born a pride which now protests against speaking so much of Sorrow. Sorrow becomes a subject for irony. And God, its creator, is spoken of with irony as well. He is called the "Great Master of Funerals," "the Jester," "the Potter, who amuses himself with his wheel. . . ." Only from time to time the irrational belief revives that suffering cannot be worthless and devoid of purpose. And it becomes evident also that there is still much to say in praise of Love. Kasprowicz glorifies its power in a transposition of the Indian motif of *Savtri*.

There is no sudden spiritual illumination in Kasprowicz's life like that which was known to Pascal. It was by slow and unobserved degrees, by an almost secret way that this "certainty," for which he had so long yearned, was finally given to him. It is astonishing that one of his poems (in the new collection *The Moments*) bears in its very title these words: "Only a fool has certainty." But this same poem ends with a conclusion that to have certainty, though for a moment only, is such immense happiness that one may well pay the price of being called even the greatest of fools (Something of this kind was said long ago by St. Paul in his first letter to the Corinthians.) Other strange truths are now revealed to the poet. He sees the splendour of the sun. He sees the fantastic beauty of the real earth. Ancient ruins teach him that even in sorrow there can be joy.

And then Kasprowicz—now a man of about 50—produces the greatest of his works, *The Book of the Poor*.

His new attitude towards existence appears all the more dis-

tinctly as he often mentions his earlier years—as if he intended to survey all the road over which he had passed. He compares his life to a wave which, translucent though it be, cannot escape being sometimes darkened by clouds, and soiled by slime. He remembers well how, moved by human misery, he had challenged the Creator. Even now he feels the proximity of a giant shadow which robs him of his joy. But all this gloom disperses as soon as he begins to contemplate the green grass of a meadow or the blaze of the sun. And this is neither a senile dryness nor a luxuriant selfishness. The poor and the suffering are always near the poet's heart, and those who are struggling with destiny are the first object of his care. His love for his fellow-men seems to him "as great as this dear earth of ours is large." If he does not any more curse Destiny for them, it is because he has ascended to a height from which life after all and in spite of all is seen as free and unbound. The creative winds of eternity are making all things simple and all things great. Immensities are no more necessary. Every trifle created bears witness to the Mystery of Mysteries. It is enough to tread a well-known, monotonous path. Every trembling little tree yet whispers the most essential truth. "There is a God, What more do you want?" The most miserable of men seems to say by the very fact that he exists. "Eternity is walking by your side." There is then a truth—above all human and cosmic dramas—a truth that orders us to welcome life spontaneously; this truth is existence itself.

Humility, which before that time had accompanied only rare moments of the poet's happiness, is now continually with him. Promethean pride, creative individualism, independence of mind—the poet looks back at it all with an indulgent smile. His soul would now stand dumb with astonishment before a nasturtium, a mole or a crow. If he is sometimes proud, it is because he can admire everything. "I would kneel in public," he says, "before the smallest speck of dust." And these are not only artistic illusions. We are perhaps best convinced of it by that poem from *The Book of the Poor* in which life is symbolised as so much snow. This snow looks lovingly and imploringly at the sun, and the sun "with a radiant smile" slowly devours its heart. Words marvellous in their plainness depict the whole sublimity and the whole severity of this parable of snow. "He will devour her entirely—until her days are consummated—until, ineffably thirsty for love—she will dissolve in his embraces."

Was this new attitude of the poet firm and was it to last? The war proved to be its touchstone. The first part of *The Book of the Poor* was already written when war broke out. At first it revived

in Kasprowicz his early Shelleyan hopes that in this enormous historic cataclysm Evil would be finally destroyed and God would make His dwelling in the human temple. Next, the horror of events awoke dread in him and called forth again the imagery which he had used in his odes. He had the feeling that God "had consumed Himself forever with His own fire," and that "Hell was driving men to murder." He desired to be blind, lest he should see perdition trampling down the world which yesterday was alive. But there was a still greater calamity to be feared—that our brains might be stunted, that our hearts might turn to ashes. And in powerful words Kasprowicz prays for the strong and wide life of the soul. Let the soul be turned up by the ploughs of heaven, the ploughs that are greater than the world and as hard as a mind without mercy. Let them make furrows as deep, as is deep the poet's desire that God be together with man. Let the world be burnt up, if only our yearning souls are saved.

Ten years after *The Book of the Poor* the last collection of Kasprowicz's poems was published, in the very year of his death. It brought proof that the wisdom of *The Book of the Poor* had resisted the trial of time. Sorrow and bitterness are not absent. Even the possibility of despondency is often there. But the poet is always saved by the same things that had saved him already—by a glow of a sunset on mountain snows, by the moon, by the woods, by the splashing of water in the stream, by the every-day course of eternal life. He is all-indulgent and kind to everything. And when, disguised as a wandering musician, he prays, he implores God to preserve for him the gift of gratitude and above all to guard him from despair.

\* \* \*

Prayer was the natural form of his poetry. Already in his first collection of poems—positivist though he was in those days—he had prayed; he humbled himself before Death, he bowed his head before Winter and Spring, before Night and Day. And from that time all the world was a temple in which he was seeking God. "My soul cannot help praying"; this line from his poem *On the Swiss Lake* expresses him perhaps most completely. His prayers were of various kinds. Sometimes it was humble awe before the unknown source of this world, or a glorification of the great unity of the cosmos. In other cases it was a "silent orison without words" which any discord threatened to sweep away, and the greatest care of the poet was to safeguard it. Different degrees of emotional tension and different forms of spiritual complications are expressed

in many kinds of imaginative personifications Kasprowicz likes to represent his soul, his prayer, his desire as something apart from him. Yearning in particular, the personification of the prayer-like attitude of a man who cannot pray, is often met in his poems. And his curses and blasphemies also, so frequent in the period of the odes, are nothing else but inverted prayers. Their intimate kinship with supplications and atonement are proved by the words of one of his poems (*A Fragment*), where he speaks of the "curses or whispers of perplexed prayers which are rising to the lips."

Images from the ritual of the Church were for a long time connected with these prayers. The odes *To the Dying World* in particular are full of them. It was in the last period only, when Faith became a full reality for the poet, that these images diminished in number and nearly disappeared, they may have seemed to him too sacred, or perhaps too natural. But—from the period of the collection called *Moments*—his prayers become more simple and aspiring, without symbols or personification they turn confidently to God. Kasprowicz now humbly weaves into his lyric texture the most popular, the most every-day expressions of piety. But this plainness is always saturated with feeling, and in *The Book of the Poor* it rises to the height of poetic greatness.

All the poetical meditations of Kasprowicz were executed with the aid of the contemplation of Nature. This attachment to Nature was innate in him. In the very earliest of his verses it already shows itself. It was Nature—as one of his poems says—that had "stretched her hand into his heart" and made him a poet. He has, indeed, a keen sense of some elementary kinship with Nature, it sometimes gives him the impression of breaking the bonds of the body, and sometimes the feeling of growing into the external world, becoming one of its particles. Nature was indispensable for the working of his mind, it was not only that it gave him motives and images; it furnished him with arguments. He would concentrate his thought on some phenomena of Nature and changes in these phenomena provided him with premisses for poetical reasoning. There is sunshine in the mountains; then there is hope for life. A ruinous tempest comes, the issues of life are confused.

And it is a rule with Kasprowicz that Nature is always illustrative of something spiritual. Deeply attached though he was to it, he was not at home in purely descriptive poetry. Descriptions appear in his work only in moments when he has some meaning to express by them. A wild rose bush becomes a title of one of his collections of poems because it reminds the poet of a human groan, a yearning

and a grief. Another collection bears the title *The Ballad of a Sunflower*, but this sunflower is not only a flower, but an injured being. The Jungfrau is not so much a mountain as a symbol of persistence, a bluish mist over the fields is not so much a mist as a breath of eternity. It was said by Przybyszewski that Kasprowicz "restored to the earth its metaphysical character," and there seems to be something true in this strange explanation. In every phenomenon of Nature there is for Kasprowicz, as for his hero St. Francis, "a resounding of mystery."

And his knowledge of these phenomena was great not only in intensity, but also in its scope. John Masefield, quoting a description of a horse from a Shakespearean play, demonstrated with due admiration how extraordinarily extensive Shakespeare's knowledge of horses was. One might admire a somewhat similar richness of detail in Kasprowicz's descriptions of Polish nature. Especially wild flowers, shrubs and weeds, with which he had grown familiar in the days of his childhood as a shepherd, are characteristic of him. No other Polish poet ever made so many of these plants of the fields so conspicuous in such a quantity. It can be said, that as all his poetry is a revelation of a new racial Polish energy, in the same way his physical image of Poland is in many respects new, but at the same time easily recognisable to every Pole.

As an artist he was, before all, a great master of rhythm and verse form, one of the greatest in Polish poetry. And he not only made wonderfully good use of the old Polish rhythms, but created many new ones; as for his verse forms, his art daringly availed itself of every possibility. This power enabled him to translate Greek and English poets who presented even the most formidable obstacles. He popularised, for instance, the Spenserian stanza, which was scarcely known in Poland before his time. He introduced and made familiar in Polish poetry accentual verse similar to that of the English ballads. Polish monosyllabic rhymes were exhausted by him of all their capabilities, and had afterwards only to decay.

His diction was not always on the same level as his metrical craft. In his passionate search after the truth he often neglected his verbal expression. In powerfully sounding rhythms and admirably designed verse constructions we sometimes meet prosaic or hackneyed words. His grammar is marked by certain mannerisms. There are some passages in his work which are a rather painful mixture of the commonplace and the emphatic. But, nevertheless, from his earliest printed verses Kasprowicz had the power of creative and startling images, and this power only increased in the course of

time, parallel to the general development of his poetic life and to his activities as a translator of great masters. His work over his translations of Shakespeare seems particularly to have influenced his own poetic style. One cannot help thinking of Shakespeare when reading, for instance, in *The Book of the Poor*, of the terrible ploughs of heaven which turn up the souls of men.

This love of the gigantic in Kasprowicz leads him, however, at times to fall into bathos. One might truly say of many of his compositions that they are "too strong." This is especially the case with the strange heroic-comic mystery of *Marcolphus*, in which Kasprowicz attempted to give a synthesis of his poetic experience—a sort of personal *Don Quixote*. The work is a complete failure, full of exaggerations on every side. This same "gigantic" conception is perhaps the chief weakness of the great *Odes*. We are almost stunned by these tremendous personifications, by the richness of their symbolism, by refrains constantly recurrent and by the *rubato* in rhythm.

Kasprowicz's poetry is at its best and surest when it is expressing the poet's most genuine religious attitude to life in an indirect confession, in plain rhythms, plain sentences and plain words. Such poems are the most memorable of his works. They abound chiefly in his last period—in *The Book of the Poor* in particular. Their simplicity is the result of a long process of crystallisation. The artist, to whom no metrical difficulty was a hindrance, and whose imagination was always at white heat, had far to go before he could produce this book, of which the Italian critic Giovanni Mayer says "It is difficult to meet in any European literature a volume of poems so intimately penetrated by an intense and humble love for everything created, as that Bible of the Poor, Kasprowicz's *Księga ubogich*""<sup>3</sup>

WACŁAW BOROWY.

<sup>3</sup> *Rivista di letteratura slave* 1930, fasc. I, p. 22

## VLADIMIR SOLOVYEV. (II)<sup>1</sup>

### VI.

SOLOVYEV's conception of the Universal Church is Utopian by the very fact that it presupposes a humanity capable of a superhuman perfection. Seeing in the Church, not only an organisation but a living organism in which all human beings should be inwardly united to each other on the one hand, and to their divine principle (through Christ) on the other, he was aware of the gulf dividing this ideal "invisible Church" from its visible historical counterpart. Yet since he considered the latter—with all its defects—the only institution on earth through which a spiritual action on a grand scale could be worked out, he ardently wished for its regeneration, for its ultimate coincidence with the "invisible Church," or the Kingdom of God on earth.

This was one of the reasons why Solov'yev took all matters concerning the existing Christian Churches very seriously and why he became an eloquent champion of their reunion. His French book, *La Russie et l'Eglise Universelle*, is written entirely in the spirit of a reunion between the Catholic and the Russian Churches. Even if we dismiss the question of his own conversion to the Catholic faith as irrelevant for our purpose, we cannot deny his growing sympathy with the active and militant Catholicism, so different from the contemplative inertia of Russian orthodoxy. He also stayed for a time (as a guest) with the famous Croatian bishop, Juraj Strossmayer, in Djakovo; and it is significant that his typical work of that period, *History and the Future of Theocracy* (1885-87) was not allowed to appear in Russia at all, but had to be published in Zagreb.

The title of the book may seem unfortunately worded, but after all, free theocracy is only another name for what Solov'yev regards as the true Universal Church to come. And he is anxious to show how the three powers representing the spiritual, the social and the individual principles, could create through it, in an organic harmony, a new culture, a true Christian culture, in which the position and the authority of every individual would depend only on his ethical worth and value. The natural hierarchy in such a theocracy would

<sup>1</sup> A public lecture given at University College, Nottingham, in a course of lectures under the general title, "The Religious and Philosophic Thought of Russia." The first part of this lecture was printed in the *Slavonic Review*, No. 26, p. 403.—ED.



be thus based on ethical and spiritual factors. The State would represent the human side of the Church and would be subordinated to it. The aim of both would be, however, one and the same—a true human progress in the direction of an absolute content of life on earth, and, incidentally, also the realisation of the only possible equality—the equality of all human beings before God. To use Solovyev's words, the Universal Church "initiates each individual into the wholeness of Divine Life, made manifest in man, communicates to each the absolute content of life and thus equalises all—in a way similar to that in which all finite magnitudes are equal to one another in relation to infinity. If in Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily (in the words of the apostle), and if Christ lives in every believer, there can be no room for inequality. Participation in the absolute content of life through the Universal Church, liberating and equalising all in a positive sense, makes of them one absolute whole, or a perfect brotherhood."

Believing in the actual possibility of such a new humanity, he was inclined to be almost too naive at times in his enthusiastic expectations. Once he went even so far as to hope for a voluntary union between the Russian autocrat and the Roman Pope—for the sake of a "new heaven and a new earth." At the same time it was his vision of a new man and mankind that inspired him also with his moral philosophy as expounded in his brilliant *Spiritual Foundations of Life*, and more systematically in *Justification of the Good*, which sums up the whole of his ethics.

## VII.

Solovyev's moral teaching is, above all, a synthesis of his own metaphysical principles and their practical application in the direction of his religious universalism or pan-humanity. Together with that, it is also an analysis of those innate "psychological" data of morality which are supposed to exist in everyone before, or even independently of any metaphysical or religious considerations. Regarding his own ethics, first and foremost, as a way towards what he calls the integral fulness of existence, or a perfect regeneration, of all life, he insists that a moral philosophy should endeavour to "define and to explain, within the limits of historical facts, what the relation between all the fundamental elements and aspects of the individually social whole ought to be, in accordance with the unconditional moral norm"<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup> All the quotations from *Justification of the Good* are taken from the English edition (translated by Natalie Duddington) Constable

In his quest for such an "unconditional moral norm," Solovyev endorsed on the whole Kant's view that morality is autonomous. Yet while modifying and amplifying Kant's ethics, he also pointed out his contradictions, his veiled subjectivism. According to Solovyev, Kant's "postulates of practical reason" and "objects of rational faith" move in a vicious circle. For, on the one hand, Kant deduces God and immortality from the fact of our moral imperatives, and on the other, he justifies those very imperatives by the postulates of the existence of God and of an immortal soul. But if pure morality be based upon the existence of God and of an immortal soul, which (according to Kant) cannot be proved, then the absolute morality cannot be proved either.

Man's moral conscience is either a psychological "epiphenomenon" only, or else a transcendental factor. In the first case our moral imperatives can have no compelling force except that of individual self-preservation with all its utilitarian impulses. In the second case, however, the moral law must have its foundations not in our conscience only, but also independently of it, as well as of all "practical" postulates. For, "if the moral law has absolute significance, it must rest upon itself and stand in no need of 'postulates,' the object of which has been so systematically put to shame in the *Critique of Pure Reason*. But if, in order to have real force, the moral law must be based upon something other than itself, its foundations must be independent of it and possess certainty on their own account. The moral law cannot possibly be based upon things which have their ground in it."

Contrary to Kant, who deduced God and immortality from the existence of the moral law or the "categorical Imperative" in our conscience, Solovyev proclaimed *a priori* God and immortality as a condition to the very existence of the moral imperative in man. This imperative is involved in all religious experience and "contains the complete good (or the right relation of all to everything), not merely as a demand or as an idea, but as an actual power that can fulfil this demand and create the perfect moral order, or the Kingdom of God, in which the absolute significance of every being is realised."

#### VIII.

A discussion of Solovyev's theory of Free Will and its bearing upon morality is beyond the scope of this brief survey. Suffice it to state the difference which he makes between Free Will and the Moral Freedom. In his early work, *A Criticism of Abstract Principles*, Solovyev still adheres to Kant's view that man is free only in so far

as he belongs to the transcendental world. In *Justification of the Good*, however, he keeps to St. Augustine's opinion that also in the world of phenomena man is free to choose evil without being free to choose good—since the good is given, that is, revealed to him as a commandment. When we subordinate our will to the principle of good, there is no arbitrariness in our submission, but inner necessity, for "the good determines my choice in its favour by all the infinite fullness of its positive content and reality. This choice is therefore *infinitely* determined; it is absolutely necessary, and there is no arbitrariness in it at all. In the choice of evil, on the contrary, there is no determining reason, no kind of necessity, and therefore infinite arbitrariness."

The ethical fact of this "one-sided" choice Solovyev calls Moral Freedom, as distinct from the Free Will, under which he understands the unconditional freedom of choice. He seems to be somewhat wavering, though, with regard to this point, since he goes on reasoning: "Given a full and clear knowledge of the good, can a rational being prove to be so unreceptive to it as to reject it utterly and unconditionally and choose the evil? Such lack of receptivity to the good that is perfectly known would be something absolutely irrational, and it is only an irrational act of this description that would truly come under the definition of absolute freedom or arbitrary choice. We have no right *a priori* to deny its possibility. Definite arguments for or against it may only be found in the obscurest depths of metaphysics. But in any case, before asking the question whether there can exist a being who—with a full knowledge of the good—may yet arbitrarily reject it and choose the evil, we must first make clear to ourselves all that the idea of the good contains and involves."

## IX.

With such an attitude, Solovyev began to investigate the actual contents of the good in human nature itself, in human history, in the whole of life. Believing in an objective existence of the good (in its absolute sense), he was anxious to find its elements in man's consciousness—the elements which are not prompted by the instinct of self-preservation, or by any utilitarian purposes, but which can stand by themselves, quite independently of those purposes. Such primary data of unconditional moral imperatives in man Solovyev thought (rather arbitrarily) he had discovered in the following three impulses: shame, pity and reverence.

Shame is, in his opinion, a feeling which man does not share with the animals. Its typical expression we find in our instinctive

shame of sexual relations, for example. Shame is a negation of man's lower nature and an impulse towards a potential mastery of that nature. And so its very existence is a kind of privilege, a proof of our "higher" self. Being the actual root of our conscience, shame in its growth increases and enlarges our moral consciousness, leading us thus to a gradual perfection in other spheres of life.

Pity is the basis of altruism, and as such it links man to the rest of living beings. Herein Solovyev joins Schopenhauer, although Solovyev's arbitrary identification of pity with love is (psychologically) vulnerable in more respects than one. As for reverence again, Solovyev sees its primitive manifestation in children's reverence for their parents. He also considers it the basis of all religious piety and worship—in so far as it is connected with an instinctive recognition of the existence of God and of a higher meaning of life.

In the primitive man and community, the interaction and the expression of the three mentioned impulses is bound to be primitive too. But in the course of evolution, their crude aspects give way to higher and higher forms of morality and conduct, until we rationally comprehend the supreme moral good and endeavour to realise it. Our conduct should thus be determined, not by self-interest or by illusory pleasures, but only by the norm of the highest good as represented by Christ and by that love which alone can weld mankind into one organic whole. For in the same way as the spirit of man can find its perfect expression only in a perfect physical organism, the spirit of God can be expressed only through the most perfect social body. Such a body (which Solovyev devised in his free theocracy) ought to be the aim of true Christianity. In a social body of this kind no man could be used as a means, because all its members would realise the absolute worth, as well as the cosmic significance, of each individual. In other words, "Christianity (in Solovyev's sense) has revealed to us our absolute dignity, the unconditional worth of the inner being, or of the soul of man. This unconditional worth imposes upon us an unconditional duty—to realise the good in the whole of our life both personal and collective. We know *for certain* that this task is impossible for the individual taken separately or in isolation, and that it can only be realised if the individual life finds its *completion* in the universal historical life of humanity."

So we come, once more, back to Solovyev's central idea—to his religious conception of pan-humanity. In his opinion, the chief aim of history is to transform the "natural" organisation of mankind (which involves continuous strife and struggle) into a spiritual

organisation based upon the values of the absolute good. And the "description of this moral organisation, or of the totality of the moral conditions which justify the good in the world, must be the coping-stone of moral philosophy." We must become voluntary helpers of God, and the only criterion of our actions should be Christ, or the absolute good as embodied in Christ.

## X.

It was from this standpoint that Solovyev analysed the essence of politics, economics, nationalism, legal justice, war, etc. And it is interesting to note that his Christianity is far from eliminating civilisation. In this he is the very antipodes of Tolstoy. As a matter of fact, the whole of Solovyev's moral philosophy was tacitly directed against the pseudo-Christianity of Tolstoy, which was precisely in those days very much in vogue. Solovyev has many points of contact with Dostoyevsky, but very few with Tolstoy. He is near to Dostoyevsky not only by his mysticism, by his visionary and prophetic *élan*, but also by his entire conception of the Christian religion which reminds one of Father Zosima's teaching in *The Brothers Karamazov*.

The Christianity of both is essentially mystical and dynamic, whereas that of Tolstoy is rationalistic and static. Tolstoy's religious consciousness is nearer to Buddhism—with the difference that he calls his own Nirvana "Love" or "God." Both Solovyev and Tolstoy lay stress on universalism, on pan-humanity. Yet whereas Tolstoy preaches a complete annihilation of the individual self for the sake of an amorphous humanity, Solovyev stands for the ultimate realisation of that self in and through humanity. Tolstoy demands that the individual should dissolve in mankind, and Solovyev—that he should *expand* to the size of mankind, embrace it religiously and achieve his highest self-realisation through that very expansion. Tolstoy sees in Christianity not Christ, but only His moral rules, Solovyev, however, sees in it first of all Christ as the embodiment of the God-Man, as a mystical fact of cosmic significance. Making out of his own Christian rules a procrustean bed for the whole of mankind, Tolstoy has no understanding for historical evolution, or for the resulting social and political organisations. Hence he wants to scrap the whole of our culture and civilisation. His doctrine is in essence a mixture of cultural nihilism and of utter quietism under the label of the "revised" Sermon on the Mount.

Contrary to Tolstoy, Solovyev not only accepts the historical

process, but makes it an essential part of the entire cosmic process. Far from suppressing culture and civilisation, he wants to imbue them with their highest creative potency by raising them on to that plane where the ultimate synthesis of individual and society, of matter and spirit, of God and mankind, becomes possible. Instead of preaching individual self-suppression, Solovyev emphasises, again and again, the absolute worth of each single individual as such, proclaiming that "no man under any conditions or for any reason may be regarded as only a means for purposes extraneous to himself . . . The only moral norm is the principle of human dignity or of the absolute worth of each individual, by virtue of which society is determined as the inward and free harmony of all."

The divergence between Solovyev and Tolstoy is particularly noticeable in Solovyev's last book, *Three Conversations*, which is, on the whole, his most accessible work about the "ultimate things." Solovyev never mentions in it the name of Tolstoy, yet with his sharp dialectics he undermines the basic principles of Tolstoyanism so radically that they can hardly recover. He blames the great writer's dry and calculating morality which he regards as devoid of all real, of all spontaneous inspiration of good. Debating with an imaginary Tolstoyan, Solovyev concludes: "I have no doubt that you, through an honest mistake, accept a clever impostor as the true God. The cleverness of the impostor is a great extenuating circumstance."

In the same book the disillusioned Solovyev prophesies that before the new dispensation is reached, humanity will have to pass through such trials and catastrophes as have never been seen on earth. This will be the apocalyptic period of history. But out of that unheard-of turmoil in which the reign of Antichrist will have its sway, a new humanity will crystallise—purified through suffering and ripe enough for the realisation of the "invisible Church" or for the Kingdom of God on earth. It was with this vision that Solovyev, the apostle of the God-Man, died (at the age of 47) in the same year (1900) as his opposite, Friedrich Nietzsche—the champion of the Man-God.

## XI.

Although a criticism of Solovyev's work is outside the aim of this paper, we cannot help concluding it with at least a few general remarks. First of all, Solovyev was too broad and rich a personality to be reduced to a "mere" philosopher in the old academic sense. What he was after was not a new philosophy, but a new consciousness,

a new man, a new life. He could not, and never wanted to, separate knowledge from being. Hence the visionary quality of his work goes hand in hand with its strong reformatory pathos. In his case, the philosophic, the theological and the mystical ways of knowledge coincided. The ruthlessness with which he treated certain cardinal problems of humanity was equal only to his sincerity, as well as to his naïve belief in the possibility of a universal regeneration. At the same time, he was too much of a poet and even of a prophet (in Dostoyevsky's sense) to bother about a carefully elaborated "system."

His philosophy has its own gaps (particularly in epistemology, which is conspicuous mainly by its absence). With all that, it remains stimulating in several respects. It is also a refreshing corrective to a period which is too much weighed down by the tyranny of "economic factors." On the other hand, its emotional or "ecstatic" side can easily have a morbid effect—at least on certain highly-strung natures. Thus Solovyev's influence upon the Russian school of symbolism was considerable (above all, in the case of Alexander Blok and Andrey Bely), but not always good. Healthier and more important is, of course, his influence upon the "neo-idealist" school of Russian philosophy, the numerous representatives of which are now mostly in exile (in Paris, Prague, Berlin, etc.)

Whatever Solovyev's fate in the history of European philosophy may be, we cannot deny his great significance for the recent development of religious-philosophic thought in Russia. His disciples may be scattered at present, but sooner or later, their work is bound to have its say in that religious renaissance which seems to be slowly fermenting among the bewildered and spiritually uprooted intellectual élite of all civilised countries. Solovyev's followers may differ on various single points; yet they all seem to have at least two features in common. One is their endeavour to raise the consciousness of the present-day man on to a higher level, and the other—their firm conviction that man is something more than he himself realises, and that he can grow and expand only in so far as he is rooted in the whole of humanity, in the whole of cosmic life. And such precisely was the conviction which inspired the work and life of Vladimir Solovyev.

JANKO LAVRIN.

*University College, Nottingham.*

# THE MEANING OF ART.

*Translated from the Russian of VLADIMIR SOLOVYEV by R. GILL  
(University College, Nottingham).*

## I.

A TREE growing in its natural beauty, and the same tree beautifully painted on canvas, produce analogous impressions, and are subject to the same æsthetic valuation. In both cases the same word is fitly employed for the expression of this valuation. But if there were nothing beyond this evident superficial analogy, the question might be, and actually has been, raised. What is the use of this duplication of beauty? Is it not a childish pastime to reproduce in a picture what already has a beautiful existence in nature? The usual answer to this is that art does not produce the exact objects and phenomena of reality, but only what the artist sees in them, and the true artist sees only what is typical and characteristic; the æsthetic element of natural phenomena, passing through the mind and imagination of the artist, is purged of all that is material and casual. Intensified by this process it stands out more clearly; beauty diffused in the forms and colours of nature, is presented in the picture concentrated, condensed, and accentuated. But this explanation cannot be regarded as completely satisfactory, for the simple reason that it is wholly inapplicable to certain important branches of art. For instance, what natural phenomena are accentuated in Beethoven's sonatas? It is evident that the æsthetic connection between art and nature is much deeper and more significant. As a matter of fact it consists, not in the repetition, but in the continuation of the artistic work begun in nature, in the further and fuller realisation of the same æsthetic aim.

Man in his double significance, firstly as the most beautiful<sup>1</sup> and, secondly, as the most conscious being in nature, is the highest product of evolution. By virtue of the second quality, man himself, from being a product of evolution, becomes an agent in the evolutionary process. As such, he the more fully promotes his ideal purpose, which consists in the fusion and unconstrained unification of the spiritual and the material, the ideal and the actual, the subjective and objective factors and elements of the universe. But why, it may be asked, does the world process commenced by nature and continued by man, present itself to us precisely in its æsthetic aspect, as the realisation of some artistic aim? Is it not better to recognise as its task the realisation of truth

<sup>1</sup> Here I understand beauty in a general and objective sense, viz.: that the exterior of man is capable of expressing more perfect (more ideal) inner contents than that which can be expressed by other animals.



and good, the triumph of the higher reason and will? It in answer to this we call to mind that beauty is only a realisation in physical forms of that very thing which, until then, had been known as the good and the true, then this provokes a fresh objection. The good and the true, the strict moralist will say, do not need an æsthetic realisation. To do good, and to know the truth, is all that is necessary.

In reply to this objection let us suppose that good has been realised, and this, not in any individual life, but in the life of society as a whole, that an ideal organisation of society has been attained, that universal brotherhood prevails. Let us suppose that egoism has been abolished, that all men see themselves in each, and each in all. But if this general unity, in which lies the essence of moral good, does not extend to material nature, if the spiritual principle after penetrating the density of human psychological egoism cannot force a way into the egoism of matter, then the power of goodness or love is not sufficiently strong. This means that the moral principle cannot be realised to the full and completely justified. The question then arises: if the power of matter triumphs in the end, if it cannot be conquered by the principle of good, then there does not reside in that power the real truth of existence, and is not that which we call good merely a subjective delusion? And, indeed, is it possible to speak of the triumph of good, when a society organised in accordance with ideal moral principles may be destroyed in a moment by some geological or astronomical convulsion? The complete separation of the moral principle from matter is by no means destructive to the latter, but it is to the former. The very existence of moral order in the world presupposes its connection with the material, some co-ordination between the two. But if this is so, ought we not to seek this connection, apart from æsthetics, in the direct control of the blind powers of nature by human intelligence, in the absolute supremacy of mind over matter? It is evident that great progress towards this goal has already been made. When it has been reached, when, thanks to the progress of the applied sciences, we have conquered, as some optimists think we shall, not only time and space but even death, then the existence of a moral life on earth (on a material basis) will be finally secured, and this without any connection whatever with æsthetics, so that even then it may be maintained that beauty is not necessary for the existence of the good. But, in such a case, would the good itself be complete? It is seen that it consists, not in the triumph of one thing over another, but in a free, all-embracing unity. But is it possible to exclude from this unity beings and agents of the natural world? As we cannot, we may not look upon them merely as means or instruments of human existence; they, too, are bound to enter as a positive element into the ideal organisation of our life. If moral order to be stable is bound to rest upon material nature as the medium and means of its existence, then, for its own fulness and perfection, it must include matter as an independent ethical factor. In this case the ethical

factor is transformed into an æsthetic one, for material existence can be introduced into the moral order only so far as it is irradiated, spiritualised, that is, only in the form of beauty. Thus beauty is necessary for the achievement of good in the material world, for it is only by means of beauty that the darkness of this world is lightened and subdued.

## II

A worthy, ideal existence requires the same room for the whole as for the parts, and therefore is not a freedom from individualities, but only from their exclusiveness. The fulness of this freedom requires that all the particular elements should be found in one another and in the whole, that each should fit in with the others, and should feel in its individual existence the unity of the whole, and in the whole its individual existence—in short, there must be an absolute inner union in all existence, God all in all.

A full physical realisation of this general inner union or positive all-embracing unity—perfect beauty, not as a mere reflection of the Idea from matter but its actual presence in matter, presupposes first of all the deepest and closest interaction between the inner or spiritual, and the outer or material existence. This is a fundamental and purely æsthetical requirement. Here beauty is specifically distinguished from the other two aspects of the absolute Idea. The ideal contents, if remaining only as an inner attribute of the spirit, of its will and thought, are devoid of beauty, but absence of beauty is equivalent to the impotence of the Idea. As a matter of fact, as long as the spirit is incapable of giving a direct external expression to its inner contents, as long as it cannot embody itself in a material phenomenon, and on the other hand, as long as matter is incapable of receiving the ideal action of the spirit, is incapable of being permeated by it, cannot transmute itself into it, so long is there no inner union between these main provinces of existence.

This means that the Idea itself, which is precisely the perfect inner union of all that exists, still does not possess in this its phenomenon sufficient power for the definite realisation or fulfilment of its nature. An abstract spirit, incapable of creative realisation; and soulless matter, which cannot be spiritualised, are alike incompatible with ideal or worthy existence. Both bear in themselves the clear indication of their unworthiness in the fact that neither of them can be beautiful. And so for beauty two things are required: firstly, the direct materialisation of the spiritual nature; and secondly, the complete spiritualisation of the material phenomenon as a true and inseparable form of the ideal contents. To these two conditions is necessarily associated or, to express oneself better, from them directly issues, a third. For in a direct and inseparable union in beauty of the spiritual contents and the physical expression, in their full and mutual permeation, the material phenomenon really becomes beautiful, that is, it really incarnates the Idea, and so must be just as enduring and immortal as the Idea itself. According

to Hegel, beauty is the incarnation of the universal and eternal Idea in its particular and transitory phenomena. In this incarnation they retain their transitoriness and disappear like separate waves in the stream of the material process, only for a moment reflecting the radiance of the eternal Idea. But this is possible only when there is an unconcerned, indifferent relation between the spiritual principle and the material phenomenon. True and perfect beauty, expressing the perfect inner union and the mutual permeation of these two elements, must necessarily make one of them (the material) a real partaker of the immortality of the other.

When we consider the beautiful phenomena of the physical world we find that they are far from fulfilling the prescribed requirements of perfect beauty. In the first place we cannot penetrate sufficiently into the ideal contents of natural beauty. They do not reveal all their mysterious depth, but only show their general outlines. They illustrate, so to say, in their particular concrete phenomena very elementary indications and divinations of the absolute Idea. Thus light in its physical qualities shows the omnipresence and ethereal nature of the ideal principle. Plants in their visible form display the expansive power of the vital idea and the general urge of the earth-soul towards higher forms of existence. Beautiful animals express the intensity of the springs of life united in a complex whole and so balanced as to allow of the free play of the vital forces. In all these cases there is doubtless an embodiment of the Idea, but only in a very general and superficial way—only in its externals. Thus superficial materialisation of the ideal principle in natural beauty, corresponds to an equally superficial spiritualisation of matter, and from this arises the possibility of an apparent contradiction between the form and the contents. Thus a typically evil beast may be very beautiful. (Here the contradiction is only apparent, for the simple reason that natural beauty, owing to its superficial character, is generally incapable of expressing the idea of life in its inner, moral quality, but only in its outer physical attributes, such as strength, speed, freedom of movement, etc.) In addition, there is a third essential imperfection in natural beauty. Such beauty is only external, and generally covers deformity in the material existence; it does not penetrate completely. For this reason it is preserved durably and without change only in its general moulds, kinds, and forms. Every particular beautiful creature or phenomenon, however, in its proper life, remains subject to the material process, which first breaks into its beautiful form, and then destroys it utterly. From the point of view of naturalism, this perishability of all the individual phenomena of beauty is a fatal, inevitable law. But in order to reconcile ourselves, even though in theory only, with this triumph of the all-destructive material process, we must look (as some adherents of this school of thought actually do) upon beauty and all that is ideal in the world as the subjective illusion of human imagination. But we know that beauty

has an objective significance, that it operates outside the world of man, that nature herself is not indifferent to it. This being so, if nature does not succeed in realising perfect beauty on the plane of physical life, it is with good reason that she raised herself from this lower plane to that of the conscious life of man, even though this was done by dint of toil and effort, through terrible catastrophes and through breeds—monstrous indeed, but necessary for her final purpose. The problem unsolved by physical life must find its solution in the creative power of man.

From this arises the threefold task of art in general. (1) A direct and objective rendering of those profound inner definitions and qualities of the living Idea, which cannot be expressed by nature. (2) A spiritualisation of natural beauty, and through this (3) the immortalisation of its individual phenomena. This means the transformation of physical life into spiritual, that is, into such a life as has the three following characteristics. Firstly, its message, or revelation, lies within itself, it has the power of direct external expression, secondly, it can inwardly transmute, spiritualise matter, or become really incarnate in it, thirdly, it is free from the power of the material process and therefore endures for ever. The perfect incarnation of this spiritual fulness in our reality, the realisation in it of absolute beauty, or the creation of a universal spiritual organism is the highest task of art.

We look upon the estrangement now existing between art and religion as a transition from their early fusion to a future free synthesis. For that perfect life, the anticipation of which we find in true art, will be based, not on the absorption of the human element by the divine, but on the free and mutual action of them both.

We are now in a position to give a general definition of art in its essential. Every sensible representation of any object or phenomenon whatever, regarded from the point of view of its final state, or in the light of the future world, is a work of art.

### III.

These anticipations of perfect beauty in human art fall into three classes: (1) The direct or magical. These occur when the deepest inner qualities uniting us with the true substance of things and the unseen world (or if the term be permitted, with existence "an sich" of all that is) break through all conditionality and material limitations, and find a direct and complete expression in beautiful sounds and words (music and in part pure lyric poetry). (2) The indirect. These are produced by the intensification of given beauty. The inner essential and eternal meaning of life is hidden in the particular and casual phenomena of the world of nature and man, and is only dimly and inadequately expressed in their natural beauty. But when this inner meaning is revealed and made clear by the artist by his reproduction of these phenomena in a

concentrated, purified, and idealised form, he produces by his intensification of a given beauty an ideal anticipation of the perfect. Thus architecture reproduces in an idealised aspect the known regular forms of natural bodies, and expresses the victory of the ideal forms over the fundamental anti-ideal property of matter-gravity. Classical sculpture idealises the beauty of the human form, while strictly observing the fine but precise line which separates the beauty of the body from that of the flesh, and thus it anticipates in its images that spiritual corporality which will one day be revealed to us in a living reality. Landscape painting (and in part lyrical poetry) reproduces in a concentrated aspect the ideal side of the complex phenomena of external nature. It liberates them from the casual properties of matter—even from its three dimensions. Religious paintings and poetry are idealised reproductions of those phenomena in the history of mankind, in which the higher meaning of our life was foreshown. (3) The third kind of æsthetical anticipation of a future perfect reality is indirect and negative. It arises from the reflection of the ideal in a non-corresponding medium, typified and intensified by the artist so as to give a clearer reflection. The non-correspondence between a given reality and the ideal or higher meaning of life may vary in kind. In the first place a certain human reality, in itself perfect and beautiful (that is in the sense of the natural man) does not, however, satisfy that absolute ideal for which the spiritual man and humanity are destined. Achilles and Hector, Priam and Agamemnon, Krishna, Ardjuna and Rama are undoubtedly beautiful, but the more artistically they and their doings are depicted, the clearer it is in the end that they are not real people, and that it is not their exploits which constitute the true concern of men. Homer in all probability, and certainly the Indian poets, had not this thought in view, and we are bound to regard the heroic epic as an unconscious and confused reflection of the absolute ideal in a beautiful but inadequate human reality, which for this reason is doomed to destruction.

We find a profounder connection with the unrealised idea in tragedy, where the very characters represented are penetrated by the consciousness of the inner contradiction between their reality and that which ought to be. Comedy, however, strengthens and deepens the feeling of the ideal in a different way. In the first place, it emphasises that part of reality which in no sense of the word can be called beautiful. In the second place, it exhibits the characters living in that reality as being fully satisfied with it, and thus it intensifies their contradiction with the ideal. It is this self-satisfaction, and by no means the external relations of the subject that constitutes the essential indication of the comic as distinguished from the tragic element. Thus, for instance, Œdipus, who killed his father and married his own mother, might still have been a very comical character, if in his strange adventures he had assumed a good-natured self-satisfaction, considering that everything

had happened accidentally, and that he was in no way to blame, and therefore might peaceably enjoy the kingdom he had gained <sup>2</sup>

We define comedy as a negative anticipation of beauty in life by means of a typical representation of an anti-ideal reality in a state of self-satisfaction. By this self-satisfaction we do not, of course, in any way understand the satisfaction of any particular character in any particular set of circumstances, but only a general satisfaction with the whole given organisation of life, a satisfaction which is fully shared by those characters who in a given moment are dissatisfied with something or other. Thus Molière's heroes are very dissatisfied when they are thrashed with sticks, but they are fully satisfied with that order of things in which thrashing is one of the fundamental practices of society.

Sometimes, a moral indignation at some detail or other emphasises the satisfaction with the evil reality as a whole, and thus intensifies the impression of the comic. Thus in Kobylín's play, "The Wedding of Krechinsky," the brilliant comicality of a monologue is founded on the fact that the character speaking, who has suffered for card-sharpping, considers it perfectly normal that some people should cheat at cards and that others should thrash them for doing so, and is indignant only at the excessive punishment inflicted in the particular case.

In addition to the distinction noted between the epic, tragic, and comic elements,<sup>3</sup> we may divide, as is usually done, all human types subject to artistic reproduction into positive and negative. In this case it is easy to see that the former are bound to predominate in sculpture and painting, and the latter in poetry. For sculpture and painting have to deal directly with bodily forms, the beauty of which already exists in reality, although it still requires to be intensified or idealised. Poetry, however, has as its chief subject the moral and social life of man, and this life is infinitely distant from the realisation of its ideal.

It is evident that the prophetic divination and the directly creative power which are indispensable for the poetic representation of a perfect man, or an ideal society are not required for the sculpture of a beautiful body or the painting of a beautiful face. Therefore, with the exception of the religious epics (which for the most part deserve commendation rather for the intention than the execution) the greatest poets have refrained from representing purely ideal or positive types. In Shakespeare such types are either hermits (in *Romeo and Juliet*) or magicians (in the *Tempest*). Generally speaking, they are women possessing a

<sup>2</sup> Of course, it might have been possible to consider the position a comic one, precisely because the crime had not been a personal and premeditated action. The conscious criminal, satisfied with himself and his deeds, is not tragic, but repulsive, and certainly he is not comic.

<sup>3</sup> In the domain of representational art historical painting corresponds to the epic and partly to tragedy, genre-painting to comedy, portrait painting may have an epic, tragic or comic significance, according to the kind of person depicted.

directly natural purity rather than a spiritually human moral character. But Schiller, who had a weakness for virtuous types of both sexes, described them rather badly.

In the very greatest works of poetry the meaning of spiritual life is realised only by means of a reflection of a non-ideal reality. To see that this is so, let us consider Goethe's *Faust*. The positive meaning of this lyrical-epic tragedy is revealed only in the last scene of the second part, and is resumed in a general form in the concluding chorus "*Alles Vergangliche ist nur ein Gleichmuss*". But where is the direct organic connection between this apotheosis and the other parts of the tragedy? The heavenly powers and "*das ewig Weibliche*" appear on high, they do not issue from the contents of the tragedy itself. The idea of the last scene is present in the whole of *Faust*, but only as a reflection of the action, partly real, partly fantastic, of which the tragedy itself consists. Just as a ray of light plays in the diamond to the delight of the beholder, but without any change in the material basis of the stone, so the spiritual light of the absolute idea illuminates in the play the dark human reality, but leaves its nature entirely unchanged. Let us suppose that a poet mightier than Goethe or Shakespeare had presented to us in a complex poetical work an artistic, that is, a true and concrete representation of purely spiritual life—of the life which ought to be—that which realises perfectly the absolute ideal.

Even such a miracle of art, which up to now no poet has succeeded in producing, would in our present reality be only a magnificent mirage in a waterless desert, arousing, but not relieving, our spiritual thirst. Perfect art in its final task must embody the absolute ideal, not only in the imagination, but in very deed, it must spiritualise, transubstantiate our actual life. If it be said that such a task goes beyond the limits of art, the question arises. Who has fixed such limits? We do not find them in history. There we see art in the course of change—in the process of development. Separate branches attain the perfection possible in their kind, and make no further progress, on the other hand, new branches arise. We all, apparently, agree that sculpture was brought to its final perfection by the ancient Greeks, and it is hardly possible to expect further progress in the domain of the heroic epic and pure tragedy. I take the liberty of going further, and, I do not find any particular boldness in the assertion, that just as the forms of art referred to were brought to their perfection by the ancients, even so modern European nations have already exhausted all the other forms of art known to us, and, if art still has a future, it must be in a completely new sphere of action. Of course, this future development of æsthetic creation depends on the general course of history, for art in general has for its province the embodiment of ideas, and not their genesis or growth.

## STUDIES IN JUGOSLAV PSYCHOLOGY (III)<sup>1</sup>

### THE GROUP OF "STARI VLAH" OR "ERA"

ON reaching Užice one comes to the Stari Vlah group, which reaches southwards as far as the mountain Zlatan and the river Lim, and in some cases extends beyond the river. It also embraces the inhabitants of Ravna Senica, though they have certain psychological features that might seem to put them into a separate category when they are studied in great detail.

The people of this area are less open to cultural influences than those of the Šumadija, and are dependent upon geo-physical conditions. They live a patriarchal life and are pre-eminently stock breeders.

Up to Ravna Senica Stari Vlah is a district of lofty, terraced mountains, such as Zlatibor, Murtenica, and Zlatan. It has deep valleys and is one of the greenest districts of the Dinaric mountain zone, with its pasture lands, meadows, and forests, some of which are coniferous. Its height above sea level, its forests and its severe climate have a strong influence upon all phases of the life of the inhabitants, but we can only consider one example of it—the influence of the geo-physical conditions upon the scattered type of village in which the houses are at a great distance from each other.

Here and there one sees an isolated house high up on the side of a valley, standing in a small clearing or open space with the thick forest all around it. The houses are made of wood and are roofed either with wooden slates or with thatch kept down with poles. Round the houses are the wooden outhouses—the dairy, the balconies and other buildings. In the river below is the water-mill that rattles on alone; and far above the houses, sometimes even above the belt of forest, are the wooden cattle-sheds, which are often covered with bark. The majority of the agricultural implements are made of wood, and so are the vessels for the household. It is essentially a district in which a wood culture prevails.

The isolation of the houses and of the individual families in the clearings of the great forests is characteristic of the villages of Stari Vlah. The nearest neighbour generally lives at the bottom of the mountain. Each family with its two or three houses is prac-

<sup>1</sup> See the two previous articles in No. 26 of this *Review*, p. 375, and in No. 27, p. 662 —ED.



tically dependent upon itself, and that has the effect of increasing individuality, separating people and developing feeling and meditation. In winter and in bad weather this isolation is still further increased. Considerable physical exertion is needed to get the necessities of life and to do whatever has to be done out of doors. The people have to go up the mountain or down the mountain, and to cross deep ravines and valleys to get water, to look after the stock and to fetch whatever they need. They have to accustom themselves to enormous exertion for a short period, but when once that is over they can rest, and pass their time in idleness.

The chief interest is stockbreeding of the coarser kind of stock. They cure hams and other meat, and make cheese on a sufficiently large scale to export it. They sell tar and candles, vats, buckets and wooden implements. In addition to their stockbreeding and working in wood they do a certain amount of agriculture. They sow rye, oats, buckwheat, and, less frequently, maize and wheat. Plum growing is only possible in the lower and more sunny valleys.

The first impression one gets of the people of Stari Vlah is mainly the following.—

They seem to be blackened and impregnated with the smoke of their houses and tar-vats. They are brown and dark-complexioned and have small faces with sharp features, which are the result of their mountain life and of the hardness of their existence. Their skin is burnt up and has the well-known look of having been reddened by continual contact with wind and bad weather. Both men and women wear black clothes made of wool, and the men's "pelengiri"—the short-wide trousers that do not either tie up or go into their stockings—are particularly characteristic. They speak in a laboured way and are slow of movement and at their work. These characteristics and their dress make them distinguishable at a first glance from the people of the Šumadija, and still more from the Serbs of the Morava and Vardar, who speak briskly and concisely and are far quicker in their movements and their work. The men of Stari Vlah call out to each other from mountain to mountain with their laboured speech and sing so monotonously that it hardly seems like a song. They often stop up one ear while they are singing. In spite of their sharp hearing, the people of Stari Vlah have narrow interests and are slow of understanding—a fact that they try to conceal with a kind of native cunning of which I will speak later. They have a certain instability of character, and some of them are lawless with a kind of lawlessness that comes from living in a village and from their former Hajduk existence.

The people of the Stari Vlah generally live very simply, but the better houses are astonishingly well arranged and managed. They have separate dining-rooms for each of the married members of the *zadruga*, and they have delicious native dishes which are not made anywhere else. They have a certain sense of beauty and a decided idea of geometrical ornamentation, etc. Such houses, however, are exceptions.

The difference between their material civilisation and their psychological development is astonishing to the observer. They have a moral and spiritual sensitiveness, and many of them can feel the beauty of things and can find an artistic way of expressing it. They are receptive and original, and have a good deal of unexpected spiritual and moral energy.

Stari Vlah is the most primitive of all the districts inhabited by the Dinaric Serbs, and its people have a distinctive form of wit and cunning, and a lively power of repartee which makes them good story tellers and good talkers. They also have the usual Dinaric characteristics—including a particularly strong sense of nationality. The district has produced a great many self-educated persons, and the desire for education is very general. One finds, however, a greater tendency towards a Hajduk life, and more of the Hajduk mentality in Stari Vlah than in the Šumadija.

The wit and cunning is called "Erin," after the land in which it prevails, and there are two types of it.

The ordinary type, that appears in every-day life, is illustrated by a well-known story which describes how a man of Era wandered about "like a poor devil" outwitting everybody, and particularly the people of the Dinaric district. He could take a pot of broth from under their very noses, and snatch the tastiest bits as it was being poured out.

In Serbia this type of cunning is regarded as astuteness of a high order. It is well illustrated by the following story:—

When Miljko captured Mićić on Zlatibor in 1842, he bound him and took him into Užice. A peasant from the district met him and asked Miljko to allow him to speak to his former lord. Having obtained permission for this, the peasant put his arms round the bound legs of Mićić and cried: "When you come back to us, the sun will shine again." Then he went up to Miljko, lowered his voice and said with a wink: "Take the villain away and kill him." On his way home the peasant thought to himself "I have been reconciled to my master Mićić, and I have paid homage to the other man, so I hope neither of them will do me any harm."

This kind of case, which is of constant occurrence, can be regarded from two points of view. The peasant was safeguarding himself from violence in his own way, and it is not only peasants of Era who do such things. What is specially characteristic of the type of man, is the neat and intelligent way in which he managed it.

In addition to this "ordinary" cunning that is used in the affairs of everyday life, there is what is known as "*the cunning of heroes*," which is described in the heroic ballads. None of them are included in Vuk's collection, but they are still current among the people. A certain teacher, Jevrem Čakarević, sang me the following one to the gusla.

A thick mist had fallen over Kosovo, and Banović Sekula was riding across it. Suddenly there appeared out of the mist a hero on a white horse. The horse was lame in three legs and the hero was half-dead, and beat his chest with his arms. He seemed weak and powerless. As he passed him, Sekula tore a golden plume from his helmet and went on over the plain. The unknown hero joined Sekula and begged him to return the golden plume from his helmet, but Sekula paid no attention to him and went on, leaving the weak and broken hero and his horse far behind. When the unknown hero was tired of begging in vain for his plume, he spurred his horse, which leaped into the air to the height of three lances, and reached Banović Sekula. The latter was terrified when he saw himself confronted by a perfectly sound and enraged hero. The hero struck Sekula with his mace and threw him from his horse, but before killing him he asked his name. Sekula told it him, and added that he was a nephew of Sebinjanin Janko. Then the unknown hero told him that he was Jovan of Kosovo and that he was a friend of Sebinjanin Janko, and that because of this friendship and for no other reason he would leave Sekula his head. The poem adds that Jovan of Kosovo often deceived people in this same way—leading them on to insult him and then "cutting them to pieces on Kosovo."

A man of Staro Vlah would interpret this story as a proof of superior power on the part of Jovan and a punishment of injustice.

I agree with Miličević<sup>2</sup> in thinking that this kind of cunning is more innocent than is generally supposed. In the majority of cases it is the expression of a natural liveliness of temperament, which provides an example of their superiority and of their sharpness in dealing with foreign slowness and stupidity. The real aim of this cunning is to outwit an opponent. It may occasionally result in

<sup>2</sup> M. Miličević (1831-1908) wrote chiefly about the customs of the Serbs

material profit, but the joy of outwitting someone is always greater than anything material that can be gained

This passion for outwitting other people makes the people of Stari Vlah far more inclined to be insincere than the other peasants, and as they often accomplish their object in a very alert and intelligent way, they have gained a great reputation for it. Many of their sayings have been preserved and are current over a large area.

Stari Vlah is a much more talkative district than the Šumadija. Many of the inhabitants can tell a story charmingly, illustrating it with witty expressions, proverbs and amusing sayings. It is, in fact, a district of story-tellers and conversationalists. They excel the whole of Serbia and many other districts outside Serbia in the delicate nuances of their expressions. At the present time a good number of them have advanced beyond the stage of being purely natural talkers, and have educated themselves in speaking. Nearly all of them have the power of observing themselves and others from a psychological point of view, and they are particularly quick at grasping the weakness and aims of other people. They generally begin speaking with a long preamble in which they sound the opinion of those to whom they are talking. They have an amazing skill in manipulating words, and they make use of proverbs or phrases to turn the conversation, when it comes to something about which they do not wish to speak or in which they are not interested. They are particularly clever at avoiding talking of matters of which they are ignorant and of people or personal characteristics if they wish to avoid giving offence. They are very clever at pretending they do not understand things that are contrary to their own interests, and they are capable of twisting and turning their words to such an extent that they can leave whatever impression they wish. One cannot help feeling that these peculiarities point to a vein of romance in their character.

One result of this quickness of temperament and cunning is that many of the educated people of Stari Vlah grasp the main point of an argument exceedingly quickly; but, having done so, they are satisfied and do not take the trouble to go any further into the matter and to follow up other lines of thought. They are therefore inclined to be superficial, and there are gaps in their reasoning because they fail to grasp the whole situation or to work it out thoroughly. This, however, is seldom apparent because they bring such an amount of clarity, force and spirit to bear upon their explanations and beliefs that they convince at once. These defects will certainly become less when they have had a longer training.

The most talented of them have depth as well as sharpness, and great penetration as well as intelligence, while their psychological astuteness and penetration are coupled with finesse and wisdom. The best example of a man of this type is Miloš Obrenović, whose character in the main was essentially Serbian.

Another characteristic of the people of Starı Vlah is that an enormous number of them have taught themselves to read and write, and that they have a passion for education. There are villages in which only a handful of men and women cannot read. A great many of them can also write—and this when not a single one of them has been to school. They have taught themselves, learning from each other just as they learn to weave baskets and to paint distaffs. They have a great longing for schooling and for education, and the most ordinary peasants respect "the learned." They pay particular reverence to families that "have provided priests for three hundred years." There are certain families that are called "Kadivlje" (velvet-clothed), because they have been priests and teachers for generations, and these have always been prosperous and influential.

#### THE TRIBAL TYPES OF HERCEGOVINA AND OF THE MOUNTAINS

The tribal districts begin to the south-west of Ravna Senica. The first is that of the Vasojevići with the Sekulari—and these, with others further to the north-west, form the group of "Mountain and Hercegovinian tribes."

The journey from the Šumadija up to this point has shown clearly how the isolated families and scattered *zadruga* of the Šumadija give place in the district of Starı Vlah to large numbers of great *zadruga* which have no tribal organisation but strong tribal feelings. The latter are particularly noticeable in Ravna Senica, and the Vasojevići mark the beginning of a district of tribal organisation that lasts right up to Bocche on our transverse section.

Some of these tribes are very old, and some were founded during the Turkish period—from the 15th century onwards, but none of them grew up round a single ancestor, as many of the older writers believed. Recent research has proved that they are either a combination of a considerable number of families and brotherhoods or that various families and brotherhoods have entered a particularly strong group. The varied elements of which a tribe was composed had to be moulded into a single whole, and the process was not always accomplished without friction. A certain amount of modification had to be suffered by the newcomers, who generally

modelled themselves upon the original members of the tribe or upon settlers who had arrived before them. The original members often joined up with Uskoks who came from Raška, Zeta, Kosovo, and Metohija, Hum or Hercegovina.

Their psychological characteristics are more like those of the people of Stari Vlah, and even of the Šumadija, than those of the tribes of Old Montenegro. The Vasojevići pride themselves upon being particularly pure Serbs. They not only call the old settlers "Srbijaci" (which means that they are not quite as pure Serbs as themselves), but put many other neighbouring Serbs into the same category. Although—like all mountain people—they have too good an opinion of themselves, there are among them a good number of shrewd and broad-minded peasants who can reason upon any subject and even estimate the importance of their own tribe dispassionately. These peasants are like those of the Šumadija.

Tribal discipline has generally become feeble, so that it does not prevent them from being enterprising, and they undertake a great deal of work. They have a degree of passion for personal freedom and for education that is rare even among the Serbs. They spend a great deal of time and energy on story-telling and conversation, and of late years a habit of flattery and adulation seems to have spread to them from Montenegro.

Even in Stari Vlah stockbreeding is the chief interest, and both in Senica and in the Vasojevići district it is so predominant that it has practically ousted agriculture entirely. Whatever cultivation is carried on, is chiefly to be found in the enclosed valleys and terraces of the river Lim.

In this stockbreeding area the women work harder than the men, because they are entrusted with various tasks in connection with the stock as well as with all the household duties—while the men are often idle.

This district offers infinite leisure of mind and body. Some of the men simply go to the mountains for their own amusement and do practically nothing. The rest spend nearly half the year in the fresh mountain air of the high pasture lands above the villages—either living in their huts or beside them. Their work is very slight and simple.

This kind of life has increased and stored up their physical energy, and it is largely the reason why they are so sound and prolific. In fact, they have accumulated enough energy to last over many generations.

All these people love the mountains and their summer life on

them, and they also have an idea of nature study. Their leisurely life on the mountain heights gives them an outlook over the neighbouring districts, they know even the most distant summits, are inquisitive, and often know a good deal about districts that are far away. They have broad and not always purely national ideas. Their powers of meditation and imagination develop spontaneously.

There are many indications that it was in the main these shepherds, with the neighbouring Montenegrins and Hercegovinians, who were the creators of the Serbian works of art, and particularly of the epic poems. In addition to this they were constantly fighting over pasturage with the Albanians or even with the neighbouring Serbian tribes—with the result that their presence of mind and their heroism underwent a hardening process.

Another result of their life as stockbreeders, however, was the development of certain characteristics—of which laziness was the most noticeable—because there were very few occasions upon which they had really to exert themselves. Slowness and heaviness also came from the same cause, and were further encouraged by the traditional Balkan method of transport by ox-wagons, in which a large number of these shepherds are engaged. Instability and the lack of repose mentioned in connection with the people of Stari Vlah are also an outcome of their pastoral life.

#### THE SOUTHERN PSYCHOLOGICAL VARIETY.

The boundaries of the southern psychological group in relation to the northern have already been defined. Working along a certain chosen traverse, it begins at the mountain Veternik, which forms the watershed between the Tara and the Mala Reka, and which is also the boundary between the tribes of the Vasojevići and the Bratonožići. The latter, from the psychological point of view, belong to the Montenegrin group of tribes—i.e., to the tribes of Katun, Lješan, Rjeka and Crmnica.

#### THE ETHNIC GROUP OF THE MONTENEGRIN TRIBES.

Mount Veternik is an important geographical and geological boundary. Up to Veternik the land is composed of mixed rocks—in which schist is predominant, though there are considerable isolated expanses of limestone, but from Veternik onwards, limestone is practically universal, and it is of the white and particularly solid, strong and pure type that extends to the Adriatic section.

Morphologically the rugged *karst* begins at Veternik, because up to Veternik it is only sporadic and seems to be of a very mild kind. Here the forests and open plains and meadows come to an end and are replaced by bare, rocky earth, in which the grass only comes up between rocks and stones, and there are meadows only in certain hollows known as *vrtiće* and *uvale*.

Cultivation of land is possible only at the bottom of certain of these hollows, and they are sown principally with potatoes, though occasionally with maize. The reddish soil, however, is very fertile because it is continually being renewed and refreshed by rains. The hollows are cut up by walls made without mortar into many quite tiny plots of land that belong to individual families. Both pastoral and agricultural economy are on such a small scale as to be negligible, but in the very middle of this rugged *karst* the small but fertile valley of the Zeta suddenly comes into view. The plain of Zeta, which extends from Podgorica to the Lake of Scutari, has been the main source of supply for all the Montenegrin tribes, and innumerable battles have been fought between the Turks and the Montenegrins in which the water and fish of the lake were the bone of contention. The conditions under which they live have often compelled the Montenegrins to suffer from hunger—particularly when the Turks were pressing in upon them from all sides and cut them off from Zeta and Scutari. There have been winters in which the tribes have had to eat grass roots and nettles, and to make bread out of maple wood or from the bark of trees. They were well used to hunger and had great powers of endurance, and however much they suffered from its barrenness they would not leave their own country, which was to them a symbol of their freedom.

South-west of Veternik the mountains with their summer freshness come to an end and the influence of the Mediterranean climate begins to be felt. The heat in summer is stifling and suffocating, and there are strong winds that whistle incessantly over the bare countryside. Verdure gives place to the whiteness of bare limestone. We find stone houses of the Mediterranean type and the well-known Montenegrin stone towers (*kule*), instead of the wooden houses that predominate on the other side of Veternik. One can even see faint traces of Italian civilisation.

Such are the natural features of Old Montenegro, and, in addition, it lies exceedingly high, has no roads and is impassable for great masses of troops. There are only paths—stony tracks which wind between high rocks and lead to the hollows (*vrtiće*). If you follow one of these paths with a Montenegrin, he can disappear in a moment



behind a rock—by turning away from the path—and you will never set eyes on him again unless you can call him back. The *karst* land hides a man.

Montenegro, in fact, is a rocky and unapproachable fortress which it would be difficult to enter on account of the lack of roads, the capacity of the *karst* for hiding men and the lack of means of subsistence. It is pre-eminently a *karst* fastness, inhabited by a rugged and excitable people and by picked heroes or “*uskoks*” from old Raška<sup>3</sup> (north-east of Veternik), Zeta,<sup>3</sup> Hercegovina, and the Adriatic coast. The nature of the country and the presence of those who came from the lands that had been great during the Nemanjić period have made Montenegro a land of freedom and also of avengers.

These facts explain the post-Kosovan history of Montenegro and the character of the Montenegrins. From living for centuries in the rugged and unproductive *karst* land they have become physically hard and enduring, but at the same time the softening influences of the Mediterranean climate have made them more of a Southern type than the Serbs to the north-east of Veternik.

Probably no single country has lived through such centuries of sacrifice as Montenegro, and probably no country combines such a degree of contrasting excellence and feebleness in its heroes as the Montenegrins, with their patriarchal and tribal life. There are probably no peasant women belonging to a simple people who are better or more naturally good-mannered than those of Montenegro, and in this respect the women are better than the men. Finally, every single Montenegrin—man or woman—from his earliest moment up to his death is inspired by and imbued with a consciousness of nationality and with a desire for the future welfare of his race. Until quite recently everything that goes to make up ordinary everyday life was regarded entirely as a secondary matter by the Montenegrins.

The influence of the country is plain, even in details. It is obvious that geographical forms affect not only the formation but the size of the tribes. The tribes of Montenegro grew up in conformity with morphological units—in valleys or in the series of mountain clefts (*vrtache*) and hollows characteristic of the *karst* regions. Their brotherhoods were formed in connection with certain mountain-clefts or chains of hollows. The result was a kind of *karst* tribal structure—a tribal structure modified by *karst* forms. It was the peculiarities of the *karst* country that prevented the

<sup>3</sup> As the original Serbia and Montenegro were called

formation of great tribes in old Montenegro like those in the open Brdo district and in the Hercegovinian part of Montenegro

In a mountain cleft or a large hollow the stone houses of the brotherhood are built on the rocky sides in order to leave the fertile "bottom" for cultivation. Beside the house is a limestone tank for collecting water, which is necessary because there are no springs. There are no mills because there is no running water, but certain houses have grinding mills in which they grind a little flour. There is no cattle-breeding on a large scale, though there are a few small flocks. There is a little spade agriculture. I have already mentioned that there are practically no roads—only tracks through the rocks. There are no carts or horses, but mules and donkeys, and practically everything is carried by hand or on the people's shoulders. Everyone knows the exact situation of his neighbours and—as the saying goes—"looks into his stomach." The tribes and brotherhoods help each other, and take particular care of widows and of those who cannot support themselves. They would give their last bit of food to a guest; but to strangers and to people outside their own tribe they are proud to excess. They have greater powers of endurance than any other people—a quality in which the nature of their country has educated them. The poverty of their material life has, however, produced in them certain "niggling" qualities that are particularly obvious in Montenegrins who have emigrated. When extreme hunger drives them from their own homes, they settle almost exclusively in "famous and gentle Serbia."

It is intelligible that the conditions of their life should have given them a tendency towards plundering expeditions, the seizing of cattle from the Turks and even from neighbouring tribes with violence and loss of life. These expeditions were regarded as heroic deeds and became the subject of ballads and stories. It has been well said that "if Montenegro is not a place for living in, it is a place for the telling of tales."

Tribal organisation, as well as the physical features of the country, has played an important part in moulding the character of the people. They are united by a strong tribal discipline which makes the individual subservient to the inflexible standards of the tribe, and they have a fully developed but circumscribed patriarchal point of view that has been elaborated by the tribe on the basis of tribal life and circumstances. They know definitely what to do and what to avoid—with the result that they are mentally well-balanced, and they have a certain repose, breadth of vision and warm kindness. They only lose these qualities when a "lawless period" sets

in, in which the tribal organisation is enfeebled or nearly ceases to exist and leaders are not to be found. It is at such times that blood feuds arise between members of the tribes, and every man takes the law into his own hands. This means a return to a pre-tribal and entirely primitive state.

Members of a tribe are bound closely together by two ideas as well as by their ordinary life—the honour and glory of their tribe and their idea of nationality. Their belief in Obilić, the hero of Kosovo, is just as inspiring to them as the belief in Jehovah was to the Jews of the Old Dispensation, and their chief spiritual food is the body of tradition concerning Kosovo and the Nemanjić, which is as well known to the women and children as to the men. The women of this district are certainly what the Bible calls “help-meets for man.” They not only do the usual women’s work, but do men’s work as well and have a man’s courage.

In order to carry out its ideal, a tribe must be as numerous and as heroic as possible. There is therefore a permanent desire to increase its numbers, and if a woman has no children her husband may take a fresh wife. Heroes choose wives from a family that has produced heroes, so that a kind of selective heroism is perpetuated. The idea is carried to such a pitch that until quite recently a Montenegrin girl would marry an Albanian if he were sufficiently heroic, and *vice versa*, disregarding the fact that they belonged to different religions. The larger and more heroic a tribe, the stronger and prouder is each of its members, because he knows that if anyone insults him the whole tribe will avenge him. They have a very great respect for good birth and nobility as well as for heroism, and heroism is regarded as really worthless if a man is not well-born. Leaders are practically always chosen from well-born men.

The work accomplished in the course of centuries by tribes organised as I have described is as follows —

They have defended the freedom of Old Montenegro and have helped to liberate the mountain and Hercegovinian tribes, and they have kept their minds focussed on “the land that was ours in the old days.” Sometimes they have been satisfied—“We have avenged our part of the Empire that was lost on Kosovo, so that no one can reproach us.” In early days it was mainly the tribes of Katuna who roused the rest and who were the most energetic.

“We are sitting drinking wine or strolling in level Rjeka, but the people of Katuna are not strolling.” Sometimes they roused the neighbouring Serbs by blaming them for “ploughing the Turkish furrows and paying tribute to the Agas.” They are furious with the

other descendants of Tsar Dušan, because they are not making war—"And, as for you, you fellow descendants of his, you are trading and saving money"

They often make war simply for the joy of fighting. They will collect a force and say "Where shall we go?" They make plundering raids upon stock—"The people of Grahovo went out in a body, they made prisoners, they burned and they cut off heads—they did not let us move a sheep, put an ox to the plough, or saddle a good horse, but took everything away without paying a penny" They talk chiefly of heroism "If there is good plunder, let us plunder, and if not, let us cut off good heads" Even the shepherds do not rear sheep but wait for a border war, and if there is none at the moment, they make one. They find particular pleasure in bringing back a large quantity of booty. "Here comes the neighing of the horses and the lowing of the cattle, the bleating of the sheep and lambs and the shrieks of the Turkish prisoners." But, on the other hand, a Montenegrin shepherd says that it nearly breaks his heart when a Turk kills his lambs and the white sheep look at him. Near the frontier there is so much plundering that sometimes it is difficult to find a village with any stock left, and the band collects and discusses the situation—"Who knows a village that has not been plundered and burned, in which we might find booty?" When they divide the spoils, they first set aside a portion for people who are helpless and for widows. When they capture a mountain with pasture lands, it becomes the common property of the whole tribe.

They raise forces for carrying on blood feuds. There are even occasions—though they are exceedingly rare—on which a Montenegrin will join the Turks in order to avenge himself on a tribe stronger than his own. Tribes will also fight over the abduction of a bride.

It is a blood-stained story. Every place near Old Montenegro represents an amazing chain of slaughter. For centuries no man had peace in his home, on his path, or on the mountain side where he pastured his sheep—there least of all.

The ruling house of Montenegro was in power for more than two hundred years, and it, too, played a most important part in moulding the people. It combined within itself the most salient Montenegrin characteristics, always worked in harmony with the spirit of the people, and produced some really firm rulers. The liberation of Serbia and the creation of the Serbian State were the joint work of the rulers and the people, but in Montenegro the Petrović dynasty

had first to join the Montenegrin tribes into a united State and then to keep them together. The dynasty took part in everything, and was the ruling influence. It played a far more important part in creating the State and forming the character of the people than that of Serbia, whose influence was only commensurate with the Montenegrin during the time of Prince Miloš.

In general character the people of Old Montenegro are very like the tribes of Northern Albania. The latter always consider themselves closely related to the Montenegrins, and they in turn reckon half Albania as belonging to the Serbian lands. Obilić is the Montenegrins' greatest hero, but next to him comes the Albanian Skanderbeg (George Castriota). These are variable and external characteristics. The chief psychological features that are common to Montenegrins and Albanians are their ambition and their pride, both of which are quite boundless. Heroism and heroic actions are the main thread of their existence and colour their whole life. The moment a child leaves the cradle he begins "to run after glory and fame," and their great desire is to belong to a heroic family. Everything in life is secondary to heroic ambition, and the Montenegrins are as greedy of heroism as a miser is of his money. They are so sensitive about their pride and their honour that they are apt to lose their heads over trifling matters. Life without honour is absolutely worthless to them, because honour is the mainspring of humanity. "Every mother's son is born to die, but honour and disgrace live for ever." "The sacred bread of heroism is the food for brave hearts." Everything is sacrificed to pride and heroism. They not only die light-heartedly, but laugh while they are dying. Women have strangled their children in order that they may not betray the army by their crying and expose it to "shameful destruction." Nobody grieves when his nearest and dearest dies if he has died heroically, and wives and mothers congratulate their men on their wounds, and would much rather they died honourably than lived with their honour in the least bit tarnished. Honour and reputation are supreme, and a mother and the whole tribe will glory in a brave death, and ballads will be written about it. These qualities could not be more fully developed than they have been by the Montenegrins and the people of Malisije. There are cases of overbearing conceit; but these are to be found only among excessively fierce, wild and narrow-minded men who are goaded beyond endurance by the smallest insult, and who are so hot-blooded that they immediately convert their feelings into actions which often end in crime. They certainly are extraordinarily impulsive, but the motive

behind their impulses is always their passion for honour and for humanity

The men are often solemn to the pitch of stiffness, and this has prevented the development of humour and playfulness. There are very few of the ordinary human jokes in Montenegro, and the tribes of the Pješevici and Cuce produce whatever humorists there are—with the result that they are called by the rest “the triflers,” in a rather contemptuous sense. The more intimate matters of life are not mentioned unless they appear in dreams, and dreams and prophecies deal only with the heroic future. This people's one relaxation lies in certain national customs that are observed at Christmas, “little Christmas” (New Year), and at “Slavas”<sup>4</sup>

Self-confidence—which until just lately had no limits—and a passion for “holy vengeance” are different manifestations of their pride and heroism. They are quite convinced that “God knows us, and we know ourselves, and that is all the knowledge we need.” “What has been, will be—the Montenegrins must be victorious.” They pursue blood feuds against their personal enemies and against the enemies of the tribe, and there is no peace until they have carried through this sacred duty. “If one avenges a man satisfactorily, it is the same thing as raising him from the dead.” “‘I thank God now and for ever that I should have lived to avenge my Batrić in my own lifetime’—so he spoke and died.” A further sacred duty is the avenging of Kosovo, and for that purpose they have set their teeth, cut off hands, and made hecatombs of dead bodies, but they have never yet been satisfied.

Adoration of their ancestors is another result of their tribal life and of their pride in their heroes. They know their ancestors and their characteristics often for three hundred years back, and they often have an equally clear idea of the more important characters of Serbian history, beginning with the Nemanjić period and going on through the time of Kosovo and the days of the Hajduks and Uskoks, up to the latest of the heroes of the Šumadija and of their own country. They think about them and love them.

Until quite recent times wealth counted for nothing in comparison with heroism, and no Montenegrin could gain a prominent position simply by being wealthy.

The Albanians have not the same feeling for the historical past as the Montenegrins, except in the case of Skanderbeg and of some of the Serbian historical traditions; but the other characteristics of the “old Montenegrins” are to be found in the people of Northern

<sup>4</sup> A saint's day celebrated by every Serbian family once a year.

Albania It is for this reason that the Montenegrins had a higher opinion of the Albanians than of the Serbs from the other side of the Veternik and Planinica. Ever since the rising of Kara George, however, they have loved and admired the people of the Šumadija. They sometimes consider the Hercegovinians "soft"

The characteristics of the people of Old Montenegro were fixed on the lines described above up till 1880, and they can still be seen quite clearly. In that year, however, the situation of the country was considerably improved by the Treaty of Berlin, which gave Montenegro an outlet on the Adriatic—including Bar (Antivari) and Ulcinj (Dulcigno) and the fertile district round Podgorica. After the Balkan wars of 1912 she gained the fertile Metohija and part of the Sanjak. Latterly, therefore, Montenegro has been in a transitional state. There has been competition between the points of view of the original Montenegrins and those who had come fresh into the country, and the result has been that some of the characteristics of the old Montenegrin spirit have been modified, and new ones have been added. Indeed, some of their very best qualities now seem to act as an obstacle to progress.

Writers who judge from the present transitional state of the country think that the older writers were wrong in praising the Montenegrins so warmly, but they themselves are mistaken. The Montenegrins are genuinely imbued with excellent qualities that will certainly come into their own in a new form after the present stage has been passed. It is more than worth while to make it as easy as possible for this country—which up to the present has devoted all its gifts to "vengeance"—to turn over to the new kind of life.

The disruption of the tribes has begun. Step by step the collective tribal spirit is disappearing, and with it the good qualities it had produced. Individuals are growing apart, and are losing touch with the links forged by tribal sentiment. Everyone now sees that warlike qualities and individual heroism need organisation before they can be of practical use, and therefore the State that was a federation of tribes has been replaced by a new and democratic State, modelled on that of Serbia, having a territorial instead of a tribal basis.

Here and there the beautiful traditional costume of the Montenegrin men will survive as a relic of the old tribal and heroic days. If it disappeared, the proud bearing and distinctive pose of the Montenegrins would probably go with it.

After having played a splendid and heroic rôle for centuries, Montenegro is entering upon a new phase of existence. Her karst

fortress has guarded Serbian freedom and has provided avengers of Kosovo. That part of her work is done.

She has now become a part of a great whole, and what lies before her is the development of her cultural side

It is essential that the "land of the Serbian Mission" should not lie on the edge of the country, but that it should occupy a central position; that it should be rich and fertile, that it should have an established form of government and that its military resources should be well organised. Serbia fulfils all these conditions, and after the Balkan wars Montenegro recognised the truth of this statement

#### THE BOCCHE<sup>5</sup> GROUP.

A large part of the Bocche, like Montenegro, consists of rugged karst which falls away to the Adriatic in precipices and steep cliffs. Above the cliffs is the mountain and hilly zone, and below them the narrow coastal zone. The latter has a Mediterranean climate; and lemons, oranges, palms and dates flourish there as well as olives and vines

The upper part of the Bocche is divided into two sections—northern and southern. The first lies to the north of the bay of Kotor, and includes Krivošije and Sutorina, the second begins to the south of it at Grblje and stretches over the land of the Paštrovići to Spič. Northern Bocche is very high and, except for lower Sutorina, consists of a series of karst shaft-holes (*vrtache*) and hollows, the largest of which is that of Dvorsno in Krivošije (which is an intermediate stage between a hollow and a karst "polje"). Southern Bocche is lower and contains valleys running parallel with the Dinaric range of mountains, as well as karst forms. It is milder in climate than the northern division

Above both rise the rocky precipices and mountains of Old Montenegro, through which the single road from Kotor to Cetinje passes. But for this road there are only tracks and bridle paths. With the exception of certain parts of Montenegro, Bocche has no real hinterland, and even the southern parts of Montenegro, particularly of latter years, have used Bar and Scutari as their outlet to the sea. The karst district of Bocche is very barren and cannot grow enough to be self-supporting.

The chief industry of Northern Bocche is stockbreeding, though there is a certain amount of olive-growing in the lower parts of it.

<sup>5</sup> The Italian name has been retained in the translation solely because it is more familiar to the English reader. Needless to say, the whole region is purely Serbo-Croat—Ed.



Lower Bocche, on the other hand, does more with olives than with stockbreeding. Lack of communication with the hinterland and lack of resources within itself have made Bocche always dependent on the sea. Its great source of revenue was its shipping, which carried a considerable amount of cargo. Even in the first decades of the 19th century Bocche had about 250 ships that sailed all over the world. In addition to this, many of the people made a good living as sailors.

When the introduction of steam deprived the seamen of their work, life in Bocche became very hard, because the country was suddenly thrown back upon its own resources. That was particularly difficult for the people at this stage, because they had devoted themselves so entirely to a seafaring life that they had neglected their land—with the result that both olive groves and vineyards became infected with blight. They had also given up the building industry. In the Middle Ages Bocche had produced wonderful master builders who had built many of the Nemanjić foundations in Serbia. They had also worked in Venetian territory and had built houses, churches and bridges in Hercegovina, Montenegro, and other countries. There is a tendency today to return to this industry.

Their one permanent source of income is fishing, and a large part of southern Bocche, therefore, lives by the sea, which is very productive. It has not been enough, however, to save many of the inhabitants from emigration, and large numbers of them have had to find work in other countries—particularly in America. Some of them come back after a long absence, but others remain away altogether. That is the reason why the number of inhabitants in Bocche has remained practically stationary from the middle of the 19th century (33,000–34,000).

Bocche is a purely Serbian district and its inhabitants are made up of 836 Serbian brotherhoods. Of these 137 are old inhabitants of the Zeta type. The majority of them are Catholics, but it is to be noted that there are some Montenegrins who have been converted to Catholicism among the Catholic inhabitants of Bocche. The latter form a quarter of the population. The other inhabitants are later settlers, who include 325 brotherhoods from Old Montenegro and 288 from Hercegovina. The strongest brotherhoods are the Montenegrin.

Montenegrins have been settling in Bocche ever since the 14th and 15th centuries, but the majority of the Hercegovinians came between 1693 and 1701—fleeing from want or driven out by blood feuds. Some were weak brotherhoods that had been expelled by stronger, and there were some who had come to spend the winter with their flocks in the sunny Bocche and had remained.

The composition of the inhabitants of Northern and Southern Bocche differs to a certain extent. The former contains fewer of the old inhabitants and has a good many Hercegovinian as well as Montenegrin settlers. The latter has a large number of old inhabitants and the rest are chiefly settlers from Montenegro, although there are a few from Hercegovina.

Even before the decay of shipping there were occasional causes of emigration from Bocche. In 1453, for instance, after the unsuccessful rising against Venice, the Grbljani emigrated to Italy. There are settlers from Bocche in Lower Hercegovina (particularly in Šuma, Površ, and Zupce), in Montenegro, and in Serbia. Emigration also took place after the unsuccessful risings against Austria in 1869 and 1882.

Although the majority of the modern inhabitants of Bocche came originally from Montenegro and are therefore closely related to the Montenegrins, they do not belong to exactly the same ethnic group.

The karst fastness of Montenegro was a free land inhabited by avengers who were practically always in a state of war, and the Montenegrins who emigrated to Bocche left it for a land in which they were subject to the entirely new influences of the Mediterranean climate, the sea and all the avenues of approach that the sea opened up to them. The country to which they came was far more peaceful than the one they had left. The population was scattered, but it was of ancient origin, and many traces of ancient and of medieval civilisation still remained. The political and historical development of Bocche has been very different from that of Montenegro. After the Roman and Byzantine periods came the Serbian, and while the Nemanjić dynasty was in power, Kotor had an important position. Saint Sava founded a bishopric on the island of Prevlaka, and there are very strong traditions of the Nemanjić in Bocche.

After the Nemanjić it came under the successive rule of the Balšić of Zeta, the Venetians, the French (for a very short time), and finally of the Austrians—against whom the inhabitants rose as early as 1882 (the rising of Krivošije). After the period of the Balšić the people remained in close touch with Montenegro, and at one time in ecclesiastical affairs Bocche formed part of the diocese of the Metropolitan of Cetinje. One result of the passing of all these rulers and of the existence of the numerous antiquities and old buildings has been to give many of the people of Bocche a great interest in archæology and a desire for historical information. I happen to have had personal experience of this when dealing with

correspondents from Bocche, because I found that they were so keen about history in general that they were inclined to introduce quite irrelevant historical digressions when dealing with some definite question that I had asked about emigration. There are traces of Byzantine and Romano-Mediterranean civilisation in Southern Bocche, and one can even feel the influence of Italian in the language.

All these fresh influences to which the Montenegrins were exposed and the modifications they produced in the old inhabitants, favoured the formation of a new ethnic group in Bocche. This group, however, still retains obvious traces of some of the characteristics of the inhabitants of Old Montenegro.

Plundering expeditions took place in Bocche, for instance, some forty or fifty years ago, and there were also blood feuds. The judges at the peace-making were known as "good people" or as "peace-makers" in Southern Bocche.

The further back one goes into the past in Bocche, the more pronounced does one find the warlike character of certain of the marriage customs. There are frequent quarrels between the wedding guests (the *Svati*), and particularly between the chief guests (*stari svati*). "Even now," writes Vuk Vrčević<sup>6</sup> of his own time, "a wedding is considered a very poor affair if there is not a kind of 'set to' between the *stari svati*." There used to be large numbers of men in Bocche who had a heroic way of carrying themselves, were dignified and wore the old traditional costume of the Bocche with its cloak and sheepskin cap and beautiful embroideries. Vuk says that in all three princedoms of the Grljani there were princes who were so magnificently dressed and armed that the tradition was that the Doge of Venice himself would rise to his feet if he saw them. The "carriage" of the men of Bocche (which was like that of the Montenegrins) suited their costume. They still have a special kind of self-confidence and self-consciousness that can be seen in their attitude. They are gradually losing these characteristics, but it is noticeable that they have also lost a considerable amount of their violence and explosiveness. They still have true pride, however, and the proudest of them all seem to be the Paštrovići.

Until the Austrians obtained possession of Bocche, these people had never paid tribute to a foreign State. Each foreign power had recognised their authorities and had allowed them to govern themselves by means of their own tribal orders and decrees, which were

<sup>6</sup> 1811-1882, a collaborator of V. Karadžić

promulgated by twelve heads of tribes who met on "the Fine Sand" by the seashore.

Enterprise in business developed late, but there are now good merchants and traders in Bocche. They have a strong, natural aptitude for mercantile affairs—so much so that the Montenegrins have accused them of being completely denationalised and also of being shiftily. There are certainly occasional cases in which an "elasticity of morals" has prevailed, and there has been a certain display of opportunism. Both these qualities resemble corresponding qualities in the cities on the Dalmatian coast.

Apart from what has already been mentioned, the chief characteristic of the people of Bocche is their penetration and clearheadedness. "The sky over Bocche is nearly always blue—clear and blue like the minds of her sons."

The people of Bocche are thoughtful. They can always hold their own in an argument, and they are capable of seeing both sides of a question. The latter is perhaps a result of their varied experiences, and of the fact that the coast and the sea have brought them into contact with various civilisations.

The people of Bocche are just as great talkers as the people of Stari Vlah. This point is well illustrated by the beggars and story-tellers of the tales of Ljubiša<sup>7</sup> and in the novels of Vuk Dojčinović. Their practice of story-telling has brought their language to a state of finished perfection. It is probably richer in words, turns of phrase and expressions than that of any other Serbian district. There is a great deal of conversation in Bocche, and at weddings, slave feasts, and on other great occasions they drink seven healths: to the glory of God, the glory of the saints, the health of their host, the health of the Church and of the priest, the health of their own chief, the health of the King, the health of the table (i.e., the guests). Before each health the whole company sing a short refrain at the top of their voices. Half-way through the feast "picked girl singers come in and go round the table, singing about each of the men at the table in turn." (Vuk Karadžić) When anyone dies, his relatives mourn him with "the lamentations of Zagora," which are very elaborate and expressive.

They have numbers of trenchant ready-made phrases, expressions, stories and proverbs that serve as a standard for many of the ordinary affairs of life, and they seem to be ruled by these precedents. Ljubiša has given an excellent description of this. They seem to be a mixture of all the influences to which they have been subjected,

<sup>7</sup> Stjepan Mitrov Ljubiša (1824–1878), a writer of stories from the Bocche

and especially of the two influences of the East and of Venice. They have a particularly interesting legal attitude of mind, which enables them to defend any idea as though they were regular lawyers.

The most characteristic point of all about Bocche is perhaps that it is a district of ingenious wit and humour. The inhabitants are said to be "quick-witted enough to shoe a flea and to split a hair into nine strands." They say themselves that "God gave them laughter," and accordingly they are ready to make jokes even about the judgments of the Holy Bishop.

Their humour is entirely different from that of the people of Era (i.e., of *Stari Vlah*), which is generally inclined to be sharp, venomous and primitive, while that of the people of Bocche is gentle and refined. Their type of humour is closely akin to that of the people of the Drina and Valjevo districts of Serbia.

The people of Bocche have a highly-developed consciousness of nationality, which has been strengthened by Serbian historical traditions.

The characteristics described above have not been developed to a uniform extent all over Bocche. There are, in particular, differences between the northern and southern districts. One also finds small isolated geographical units in Bocche that differ from each other to a certain extent, and to these Vuk Karadžić gave some attention.

The final proof of all this calls for detailed ethno-psychological research.

(Translated by FANNY FOSTER.)

JOVAN CVIJIĆ.

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FIVE YEAR PLAN.<sup>1</sup>

MODESTY, in the face of history, is not a common quality. Yet such a modesty, I believe, is essential to any understanding of present-day Russia. I do not refer to that modesty which helplessly recoils from judgment and so is a negation of both thought and action, but rather that attitude of mind which hesitates to interpret new historical experience in the categories of thought appropriate to the past, and halts to see how thought may be re-shaped by new events which give a new content and a new mould to thought at the same time as they call for interpretation by thought. For those who regard the Russian Revolution as a social "throw-back," as a break in the historical process, a deviation wrought by some *diabolus ex machina*, such a chastened attitude is unnecessary. Arrogance, rather, is called for. Rational interpretation is otiose because the phenomenon, by definition, fits no logical scheme. But those for whom Soviet Russia is part of "contemporary history" in Croce's sense of the term, while they have a different interest, must also have a different attitude.

The first feature which makes Russia today the most interesting country in the world, is that she presents the phenomenon of a

Planned Economy" for the first time in modern history. The 19th century was essentially the age of *laissez-faire* economic liberalism in the sphere of commerce and production paralleled that democratic liberalism in the sphere of politics which inspired the revolutionary movements of 1792, of 1830, and 1848, and represented the philosophy of the rising industrial bourgeoisie. But today economic liberalism is passing even more rapidly than are 19th-century forms of political democracy, and is giving place to centralised bureaucracies and to open dictatorship. Faced with a world economic crisis of unprecedented severity and an unemployment total three times as great as any pre-war figure, this country, like others, is increasingly talking of "economic planning"—simultaneous talk among all shades of political opinion, among economists, even among business men, and there are signs that the 20th century is destined to be an age of planning as the 19th century was the age of *laissez-faire*—planning by the State, by

<sup>1</sup> Based on a lecture given to the Department of Social Study in the University of Edinburgh on 1 May, 1931

## THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE FIVE YEAR PLAN. 81

public corporations, by central banks and syndicates and trusts in conscious pursuit of certain consciously formulated ends. The significant feature of this most recent talk about "economic planning" is that it shifts the central issue of political economy to an entirely different plane. The issue between individualism and socialism, as it was formulated in Fabian controversies of the nineties, was mainly one of static adjustment. It was a question of which economic system was more calculated to secure the best adaptation of production to needs. State *versus* private enterprise was debated in terms of whether the private *entrepreneur* or a public official was likely the more efficiently to conduct the internal management of an individual concern. But today *laissez-faire* is being challenged on the very ground where its claims were formerly the most impregnable, namely, in the dynamic sphere. "Planning" is being urged precisely to further more ambitious pioneering efforts than individualism seems capable of achieving, to secure a more rapid rate of economic progress, and to handle economic risks which seem too forbidding for private enterprise to face. It is in its capacity to carry through the reorganisation of whole industries, to effect revolutionary schemes of capital construction, to reduce many of the uncertainties which bestrew the path of the captain of industry precisely by converting certain "key" factors in the future from unknowables to knowables, that the Five Year Plan seems superior to the methods which are familiar in the capitalist West. If, as Dr. Shadwell has been saying, Russia has progressively "returned to the methods of capitalism," it is to a system so different, even in its superficial forms, from the capitalism we know as hardly to deserve the same label from clear-thinking persons.

But there is a second, and more fundamental, feature which makes Soviet Russia historically unique. It is a difference, less of economics and of economic organisation, than a social and institutional difference, connected with property-ownership and class relationships. (In other words, Russia presents us with the first historical case of a socialist society, in the only sense in which that term has a distinctive meaning, as a society where the propertied classes have been expropriated, and hence uprooted as a separate class, and all economic property has been vested in the State.) In much of the current talk about the Five Year Plan and suggested Western analogies to it this point is usually obscured. Yet this feature of Russian society is probably the most fundamental. At least it is of sufficient importance for its presence or absence to make a qualitative difference, as it were, to the whole chemical

composition. Clearly a profound difference would exist between a "Planned Economy" superimposed on a capitalist country such as Britain or U S A , and a Five Year Plan introduced in a country where individual property rights and vested interests exist no more, where new institutions, such as soviets, factory committees, and a new trade-union apparatus have taken root, and where the years of revolutionary upheaval have bred a new social philosophy and social psychology among workers and administrators alike

These two unique features alone should suffice to account for the place which Russia is increasingly holding in the attention of economists and social historians, as well as of journalists and politicians. But the combination in one of these features of Russian economy, with the technical aims embodied in the Five Year Plan, renders the economic revolution which we witness in U S S R the most significant event in modern history. In its technical aims the Five Year Plan embodies nothing startlingly new, it aims to effect that transformation of an agrarian into a modern industrial country, which occurred in England a hundred to a hundred and fifty years ago, in Germany in the seventies, and more recently in Japan. But (it aims to carry through this industrial revolution at a quite unprecedented *tempo*, and to carry it through, not as before in history on the basis of *laissez-faire* and captained by capitalist *entrepreneurs*, inspired by a profit motive, but on the basis of socialism and centralised planning.)

I doubt if any quinquennial period could be found in any country during which so large a proportion of the national income has been devoted to capital construction as is provided for under the Five Year Plan. The process of industrialisation essentially implies an alteration of the process of production in such a way that a greater proportion of mechanical power, compared to human labour, is used to create a given product. And this implies a period of capital construction, during which resources are devoted to construction work rather than to the making of immediately consumable goods. In other words, it implies a period of "collective saving" by the whole community, of which the much-talked-of "goods famine" in Russia today is the concrete example

(It is notorious that the productivity of labour is much lower, and the real cost of production is much higher, in Russia than in more developed countries of the West; and this is primarily because the development of mechanical power is relatively very backward, and productive methods consequently remain very primitive—there is much less "power behind the elbow," as the Americans



would say While pre-war Russia was immensely rich in natural resources, her industrial utilisation of those resources was still at a very low stage She remained primarily an exporter of raw products (less than 10 per cent of pre-war exports consisted of manufactured goods) and an importer of industrial goods. Her transport system showed the lowest development of any country in Europe. Even in 1928 the number of automobiles in all Russia amounted to scarcely 2 per cent of those in Great Britain, or a number approximately equal to the number in Greece or in Egypt or China. The national income per head was scarcely a quarter of that of Great Britain, and the average income of a peasant family amounted to no more than 150 to 200 roubles a year.

To Western Marxists it seemed a strange historical paradox to expect socialism to be built in the most economically backward section of Europe, and among the Bolsheviks themselves there was keen controversy in 1920, and again in 1927, as to whether "Socialism could be built in Russia alone." (But it was part of Lenin's distinctive theory of the "bourgeois-democratic revolution" that the proletariat should not wait until all the objective conditions were ripe for socialism before seizing class-power,) but that it should seize power and institute a Soviet State at the earliest opportunity. When this opportunity occurred in a backward country, the subsequent problem remained of using the power of the new Soviet State to construct socialism. How was this to be done if the economic prerequisites did not exist? Already, in 1920, almost before the civil war period was over, Lenin had given his answer, when he instituted the Goelro, or State Commission for Electrification, to prepare what at the time seemed a quite utopian scheme for the electrification of the country. Lenin declared that the completion of the political revolution, with an economic revolution to transform the whole mechanical basis of the economic system, was the only foundation on which a socialist economy could be built. As long as individual enterprise existed (with the peasant and private trader), there was soil for new differential advantages to take root and a new propertied bourgeoisie to grow. The sole means of dispensing with such individual enterprise was to effect a technical revolution in productive methods under collective control. Moreover, this provided the only road to raising the standard of life of the masses and providing the environment for a socialist culture.

Out of Goelro developed Gosplan; and in 1926-7, when the work of reconstructing war's ravages and of restarting the industrial machine approached completion, the problems of this new stage, of

this new economic revolution, became imminent. In 1927 a preliminary Five Year Plan<sup>2</sup> was drawn up which was judged to be cautious in its estimates and too low in its provisions for capital investment. At the Fifteenth Party Congress in December of that year a decision was taken in favour of the maximum possible rate of industrialisation, and in the following year a revised, and more ambitious, Five Year Plan was prepared, and prepared in two forms, a maximum and a minimum variant. The Soviet Congress to which the revised plan was submitted adopted the maximum variant, and this became the official Five Year Plan which was to control the economic activities of the State over the quinquennial period 1928-33. Each year the so-called Control Figures supply a more detailed annual programme for the ensuing twelve months, the provisions of this annual programme being adapted according to the actual experience and results of the preceding year.

The keynote of the Plan was the large amount devoted to capital purposes, and particularly to capital development in "heavy industry," or the basic constructional trades, on which the lighter finishing trades depend. Over the five-year period about 30 per cent. of the national income was to be applied to investment (a figure which compares with under 15 per cent. in pre-war Britain, and to under 10 per cent. in pre-war Russia). Of the total of 64 milliard roubles, 16.4 milliard were to be applied to industry (and three-fourths of this to "heavy industry"), 3 milliard to electrification, 10 milliard to transport development, and 23 milliard to agriculture. On the basis of this it was estimated that industrial output would be increased by 130-140 per cent. by 1933, and the total national income doubled. Allowing for a population increase of some 12 per cent., this amounts to an increase in the national income per head of over 80 per cent. by 1933.

Linked with the plans for industrial construction went the programme of agricultural collectivisation, which presents one of the most audacious economic revolutions of which one has heard. This agricultural programme was inseparable, both logically and in practice, from the programme of industrialisation, for the reason that industry was powerless to develop without an increase in the agricultural surplus from the village to supply the industrial population

<sup>2</sup> The rate of growth provided for by this was approximately the same as the estimate of probable growth which I made in my *Russian Economic Development since the Revolution*, and which several English reviewers at the time declared to be too optimistic and uncritical, but which subsequent events have shown to be too low by about a half

with food and raw materials and an export surplus with which to purchase constructional equipment from abroad. On the basis of the old peasant small-holding any considerable rate of expansion of the agricultural surplus was clearly out of the question. A development of capitalist farming, as the pre-war Stolypin reforms had tried to encourage it, might have yielded results. But apart from such a development being inconsistent in principle with the attempt to construct a Socialist State, the fruit of such a policy would have been too slow in maturing to meet the requirements of the Five Year Plan. (Between 1906 and 1916 the Stolypin policy resulted in the enclosure of about 10 per cent. of the peasant farms in European Russia<sup>3</sup>) The only alternative was to effect a simultaneous social and technical revolution in the countryside; to absorb peasant holdings into enclosed collective farms, and on these new farms to introduce modern American methods of mechanised farming. Otherwise Soviet Russia was in an *impasse*—an *impasse* created by the agrarian revolution in 1917 itself. Without collectivisation Lenin was checkmated by the Russian peasant—as most writers in the West prophesied that, sooner or later, he inevitably must be. (The Five Year Plan, accordingly, provided for 15 per cent. of the agricultural area, 20 per cent. of peasant households, and 45 per cent. of the marketed surplus to be embraced in the collectivised sector of agriculture by 1933—to be included in the category of the *Sovkhoz* and *Kolkhoz*. On these farms by that date it was planned to employ some 170,000 tractors.)

At its inception Western opinion greeted this Plan, rather naturally, as the most giant of utopian illusions. Some even hinted it was a desperate hoax to save the face of a bankrupt firm. Inside Russia a strong flavour of scepticism pervaded the majority of academic economists and penetrated even into the leading organs of the Party. On my return from a brief visit in the early spring of 1929 I personally shared this scepticism in a pronounced form: in the villages, in particular, the task seemed too stupendous to imagine its early success. But by now, after two years of the Plan in operation, informed opinion in the West appears to have accepted the view, if reluctantly, that the Plan has strong probability of achievement.

(In agriculture, the essential "tight place" of the Plan, the provisions for 1933 were already achieved by the autumn of last year,) and it was owing to the unexpected success of the collectivisation

<sup>3</sup> Pavlovsky, *Agricultural Russia on the Eve of the Revolution*, 135

campaign that Russia was able to reappear on the world market as a wheat exporter last year to the amount of some 3 to 4 million tons. Of the sown area last summer, 85,000 collective farms, combining 6 million households, sowed 60 per cent of the area sown by the remaining 20 million individual farms. The latest figures claim that already a half of the peasant households are in collective farms, and the plans for the current sowing provide for these *Kolkhozy* to sow an area of 65 million hectares (compared<sup>3</sup> to 33 million last year), or an area equivalent to half the whole area under crops in the U.S.A. In industry the rate of growth in the past two years has exceeded the Plan,<sup>4</sup> although in the second year it fell considerably short of the estimates of the Control Figures, which had been revised drastically in an upward direction with the aim of "carrying out the Five Year Plan in four years"<sup>5</sup>

There remain, of course, a large number of difficulties, many negative features. Incalculable factors exist which make any rigid forecast of the future precarious. (The problem of technical skill is an important one, and if it is not solved may well prove an insuperable obstacle to effective utilisation of the new plant.) The lack of skill applies not only in the higher grades to technical and engineering ability, but to manual workmanship in the workshop: there is a general scarcity of mechanics capable of staffing repair-shops, improvising spare parts and tools, a scarcity of a simple machine-sense among the semi-peasant labourers who are increasingly drawn upon to staff the rapidly-growing new plants. As a result, (the rate of breakages of machinery and tools is often alarmingly high) (as in the new tractor plant at Stalingrad), and the effective utilisation of the new machinery abnormally low. It is to deal with such problems that the particular "drive" is being made at present towards technical education and factory schools; while, to bridge the gap in the interim, reliance is placed on the hired aid of foreign technicians and the introduction of mechanics from abroad (mainly

<sup>4</sup> Certain writers maintain that these figures require to be discounted, (a) owing to inadequacies of the wholesale index number in measuring changes in the value of money, (b) owing to inferior quality of goods—(e.g., Prof. Prokopovich in *Annals of Collective Economy*, Vol. VI, No. I, and Prof. Calvin Hoover in *Economic Life of Soviet Russia*) (a), however, is based on a misunderstanding, as the index of physical volume of output is constructed in a manner which makes it independent of any price-index number, (b) may or may not affect comparisons with pre-war, but can hardly affect, to any considerable extent, comparisons from year to year.

<sup>5</sup> The distinction between these and the Five Year Plan itself is frequently obscured, with misleading results, e.g., in the recently published *Memorandum of the Russian Department of Birmingham University*.

from America) to instal or even to operate new machinery and to train young Russians in the new methods. Again, there are frequent complaints of the low level of "labour discipline," both on the collective farms and in the factories among the strata of recent immigrants from the village, who are usually of a lower culture than the older generation of urban workers. Absences from work, bad timekeeping, carelessness and low-quality work are the result. On collective farms, in particular, complaints of poor work are common. While the productivity of labour on a collective farm is necessarily higher, with its improved methods of cultivation, than on an individual holding, this increase would be still greater with anything approaching a "normal" utilisation of the labour forces of the *Kolkhoz*, and it is to deal with this that the principle of payment for work in the *Kolkhoz* on an ordinary factory basis of time-rate and piece-rate is now being universally introduced.<sup>6</sup> In addition, the rate of "labour turnover" is exceedingly high, higher even than in America: a fact which, incidentally, mates oddly with the pictures drawn in sections of our Press of widespread regimented compulsory labour, and it is to reduce this exceptionally high rate of "labour turnover" that the Labour Exchanges have recently introduced certain measures which approximate to the system of "leaving certificates," which were in force in this country during the war. Further, transport facilities at the moment constitute an important "bottle-neck" to industrial expansion, mainly for the reason that, more essentially even than fuel, transport stands in a "key" position to the economic system at large, and capital development work, instituted under the Five Year Plan, takes a relatively long time to yield results in enlarged transport facilities. Finally, although the U.S.S.R., alone, has not shared in the world slump, its foreign trade balance has been more unfavourably affected by world trade conditions than has that of most countries. This is due to the fact that world prices of agricultural commodities have fallen sharply relatively to industrial commodities, and Russia is primarily an exporter of the former and an importer of the latter. In addition, her exports to a large extent are likely to be sold "spot," and machinery, on the other hand, to be bought "forward" on advance contracts, so that any fall in world prices will affect the former more than the latter, quite apart from any disparity between the price-levels of agricultural and industrial goods. In its effect on Russia's ability to purchase imports, this has a significance similar to a bad harvest, and it would appear that Russia has suffered a

<sup>6</sup> Cf the report of Y. Yakovlev to the Sixth Soviet Congress.

net loss during the last year in her "barter terms of trade" amounting to as much as 30 per cent <sup>7</sup>

In face of so complex a collocation of influences, it would seem to be a rash trespass beyond the proper limits of induction to assert that "the stability in the rate of growth (over the last three years) would seem to suggest that this percentage represents an economic limit which mere government manipulation is unable to alter" <sup>8</sup> But even if this rate of growth is not exceeded in the remaining three years of the Plan, the mere maintenance of it would suffice to cause the provisions of the Plan to be surpassed before the autumn of 1933, and there seems to be no reason at present on the horizon adequate for serious doubt that this rate of growth will be maintained. This level of growth represents a figure that is about six times what was customarily conceived as the "normal average rate of growth" of industrial production in the pre-war world, and a figure at least double that customarily attained by industrial countries even in "boom" years. Such a fact as this is of outstanding significance, and seems to suggest, *prima facie* at least, that a Planned Economy is a vastly more potent instrument of economic progress than anything the economic world has known hitherto.

The U.S.S.R., I have argued, presents us with a new phenomenon in history—and new in the sense of a new composition, and not merely of the addition of certain new ingredients. And, if history moves at all comparably to Hegelian dialectic, what is new in U.S.S.R. cannot be expressed in terms of the old issues and the old antitheses. Particularly is this the case in the politico-social structure of the new order—in the relationship between man and man and the State. Clearly Russia is no democracy in the sense of the parliamentary democracies we have known hitherto. On the other hand, neither is she the familiar type of bureaucracy, as persons in the West usually rush to assume. The political relationship is something which fits neither of these simple and familiar categories; and since it is something novel and still in process of "becoming," one can find for it no neatly formulated concept. But the relation-

<sup>7</sup> For instance—to take the export and import figures (trade across European frontiers) for the first two months of 1931 compared with the same period of last year—her export tonnage increased by over 25 per cent, but the realised value of these exports fell in the aggregate by some 20 per cent. This was balanced merely by a 12 per cent (approximately) fall in the price of her imports.

<sup>8</sup> Memorandum No. 1 of the Russian Department of the University of Birmingham

ship is one in which the masses certainly do not play a merely passive part, deriving all direction from an active and dominating minority. This crude view makes nonsense of much that is happening in U S S R. today. In a very large degree, I believe, the success of Russia's economic efforts depends less on the efficiency of a governing Party and of directing officials than on the ability of this Party to stimulate spontaneous activity and initiative among the masses themselves. This is something one cannot show in figures, one cannot prove in argument, one can hardly even describe in any convenient terms. One can only sense its presence and suggest its importance and test it as a canon of interpretation to subsequent events.

Similarly, individual freedom in a collective society (it stands to reason) cannot correspond to "freedom" as it was conceived by the Liberals of 1848 (and this, indeed, was different in its appearance from its reality, being a political equality imposed upon a fundamental economic inequality). On the other hand, the sole alternative is not the old historical antithesis of freedom *versus* oligarchy, for the reason, precisely, that history since then has moved forward a stage, and in Soviet Russia, whatever the relation of the individual to the collective, the interests of the collective certainly have precedence over the interests of any oligarchic group.

(The Five Year Plan, in the ratio of its success, undoubtedly throws down a challenge to the rest of the world. But this challenge is hardly a trade challenge, as is vulgarly imagined.) For many years Russia is likely to continue primarily as an exporter of raw produce and an importer of machinery and high-quality manufactured goods. Soviet Russia does not export capital and has no need of an export surplus, as have several other countries, and hence is likely to continue to buy from the rest of the world as much as she sells. The internal market of her 140 million inhabitants is likely to absorb her developing industrial output for many years to come, and until her standard of life has been at least doubled, she is likely to be too much occupied with internal problems to spend much time in devising ways of making losses on her exports in order to annoy other countries. The challenge Soviet Russia will present, is a challenge to thought and the challenge of an alternative and rival social system, making the appeal of its mere presence to the proletariat of the rest of the world.)

MAURICE DOBB.

## THE BACKGROUND OF POLITICAL PARTIES IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA.

IN order to understand the present political development in the Czechoslovak Republic some fundamental, geographical, and sociological facts must first be laid down and realised. Although the area of the country is but little less than that of England and Wales, its population is only about one third. The mountainous and wooded eastern half is very sparsely populated. But the historic lands (Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia) have roughly the same density of population as Germany, while the industrial neighbourhoods of Prague, Plzeň, Liberec and Brno<sup>1</sup> are all so thickly inhabited that the towns now show an increase of population almost only by virtue of influx from the countryside.

In some of the towns, especially those with a German population in the north of Bohemia, an important but perhaps only temporary state of affairs has arisen: the number of deaths of the established population has exceeded that of the births.

The social structure of the most eastern section of the country, Carpathian Ruthenia, which has 140 inhabitants to the square mile, is naturally different from that of many areas in the western provinces, where there are 1,400, and the political conditions and the type of life are also essentially different. Slovakia also is relatively backward.

In addition to natural conditions, history and economic development have helped to bring about the present state of affairs in respect of the population question. The Czech lands, which lost their independence three hundred years ago, became part of the Austrian Empire, while Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia remained part of Hungary.

The religious development in the two halves of the country has followed different lines. In the Czech lands the forcible Habsburg counter-reformation was entirely successful, 96 per cent. or nearly the whole of the population belonging before the World War to the Roman Catholic church, while the remainder were Protestants and Jews. In Slovakia only two-thirds of the population were Catholics, for there the reaction had not been carried out with the same

<sup>1</sup> Pilsen, Reichenberg and Brunn.



severity and the country had become a refuge for some of those who had been expelled for their faith from the Czech lands, so that a sixth part of the population remained Protestant, the majority of these being Lutherans, who have always used a Czech liturgy and the Czech Bible. The Protestants are chiefly settled in the central part of Slovakia, where there are also some Uniats (Greek Catholics), they form the majority in Carpathian Ruthenia, and the number of Jews increases steadily towards the east.

These religious differences have a great political significance in the Republic. Whereas all the elementary school teaching in the Czech lands was controlled by the State and undenominational, that of the eastern half of the Republic had been very largely in the hands of the Church. With the collapse of Austria, the Catholic Church lost the support of the ruling caste—the aristocracy and the higher German officials. The live tradition of the Hussite period, the glorious 15th century, led to an enormous change by which the Catholic Church lost at one blow in the Czech lands almost 1,400,000 members, the majority of whom have not joined any other denomination, while the remainder have formed the so-called Czechoslovak National church. This movement only affected the Czech-speaking part of the population, while the Germans established in the country have remained Catholics. Thus the difficulties of the nationality problem have been intensified still further. No big modifications have taken place in the Eastern part of the Republic, except that part of the Uniats passed over to the Orthodox faith.

In respect of nationality, conditions were very decidedly prejudicial to the Czechs after the loss of their independence, for the most intelligent and progressive section of the population had for religious reasons been driven out of the country, and the large areas laid waste by the Thirty Years War had been settled by Catholic Germans. The towns were Germanised. With the discovery at the beginning of last century of large coal deposits, industrial enterprise on a big scale was developed by the Germans in the north of Bohemia and Moravia. The labouring Czech population which streamed in from the poor agricultural districts was Germanised. The schools, churches and official positions were German. Whenever the census was taken, the local officials brought the severest pressure to bear on the working classes to declare themselves of the ruling German nationality, and those who ventured to appeal for the introduction of Czech schools were often dismissed from their employment and hounded out of their houses. With the collapse of Austria this was all changed, any kind of constraint being legally forbidden and

all abuses during the census being punishable by imprisonment. The rights of minorities are guaranteed by law.

Even greater violence was shown before the war in respect of that section of the Czechoslovak nation which was established in old Hungary. In Upper Hungary there were at the outbreak of the war only 340 Slovak and 22 Ruthene schools in a total of 4,900, elementary schools. Some of the Church schools remained Slovak, but they almost all consisted of one class only and most of the school hours were spent in teaching the Hungarian language. The other elementary schools were Hungarian. All the secondary and technical schools, all the training institutions and the universities, had been exclusively Hungarian since 1875. The masses were deliberately deprived of any educated class in order to be incapable of offering resistance. One-third of the Slovaks were unable to read or write, because the schools were intended to spread the knowledge of Hungarian, a foreign language. Of the 1,700,000 people of Upper Hungary not 2,000 had before the war a thorough secondary school education, and the masses were deprived of leaders. The number of persons belonging to the professional classes (lawyers, doctors, engineers, journalists, teachers, priests, etc.) who proclaimed themselves as Slovaks, was quite insignificant: for instance there was not a single Slovak judge. If the system introduced by Count Apponyi into Hungarian school education had lasted another generation, it might have meant the extinction of the Slovak nation. The Slovaks were fading away: ignorance, poverty, and alcoholism were rotting and ruining them. One out of every four children born died, and the people were emigrating wholesale to America.<sup>2</sup> The Budapest Government encouraged this mass emigration. The official statistics of the U.S.A. show that in the sixteen years before the War alone, 480,000 Slovaks had settled in America. When the pressure from Budapest was removed and the Jews were allowed to proclaim themselves as belonging to the Jewish nationality (a large number of those in the East speak Yiddish and are Orthodox) some 300,000 fewer people in Slovakia claimed Magyar nationality.

The net result is that by December 1930 the Czechoslovak Republic had 14,700,000 inhabitants, and of these, in round figures,

<sup>2</sup> The fourteenth census of the United States, Vol. II, states that in 1920 there were 620,000 Slovaks in the U.S.A. The migration from Southern Bohemia and Moravia into Vienna was so great that it is estimated that almost one inhabitant of Vienna in four originates from Czech lands. In the two decades of the present century there has been a natural increase of 1,800,000 persons in the territory which is to-day Czechoslovakia, but this number has been reduced to one-half by emigration.

over 9 millions are of Czech or Slovak nationality, while there are well over 3 million Germans, 750,000 Hungarians and over half a million Ruthenes

There are very great differences in the social stratification of the population as we see from the figures for 1921, the newly collected data not yet being available. In the Czech lands industrialism has made very rapid progress in the last forty years, only about 30 per cent of the population being dependent on agriculture for a living.

The number of those occupied in industry has increased to such an extent that it provides a livelihood for forty persons in every hundred, although some branches, such as textiles, have been badly hit by the war. Commerce, transport and the professions show a decided increase. The ten million people who inhabit the Czech lands are made up of more than 3 million agriculturists, 4 million industrial workers and 1,200,000 persons engaged in business and transport. In these figures are included, however, not only those who exercise a calling but also members of their families. Economic conditions are entirely different in Slovakia and some grasp of them will facilitate the understanding of the occasional political difficulties. Out of every hundred people in Slovakia, sixty-seven today live by agricultural labour, while only 17 are engaged in industry and hardly eight in business and transport. These comparative figures are not perhaps sufficiently illustrative. In order to understand fully how primitive pre-war conditions were, it will suffice to quote some definite figures taken from the Magyar statistics of 1910. There were then living in Slovakia 3 million inhabitants of various nationalities, and 1,200,000 of these were engaged in the professions. Only 228,000 were engaged in industry, 34,000 in business, 28,000 in transport, 35,000 in the public service and the liberal callings, 57,000 were domestic servants. Allowing for some day labourers and soldiers, all the remaining 750,000 were agriculturists. As all transport was concentrated by the Hungarians in the direction of Budapest, communications are still unsatisfactory, and Eastern Slovakia is almost cut off from the more progressive Western part of the country. From the economic point of view, Slovakia was not uniform: in the mountainous areas (Orava, the neighbourhood of Prešov and the part adjacent to Carpathian Ruthenia) some four-fifths of the population lived before the war on direct agrarian products, which were often very primitive, such as pasturage. Almost all the commerce was in the hands of the Jews, who had a monopoly of the inns also, and were consequently the trusted henchmen of the Pest authorities.

Alcoholism was undermining the resistance of the Slovaks, who were kept illiterate. Those among them who were most go-ahead, had emigrated abroad. The extent of industry was quite insignificant. For example, the district of Reichenberg (Liberec) in Bohemia employed alone twice as many textile workers as Slovakia in its entire length and breadth, which again, in spite of its being only a little smaller than Bohemia, employed fewer persons in business than the city of Prague.

We might make further comparisons but enough facts have perhaps been given to make it clear that the post-war political life of Slovakia is necessarily different from that in the Czech lands and that unification in ten years is an impossibility. Scotland and England did not become Great Britain either overnight. The repugnance felt by some Slovak parties to the new order is partly the result of historical development and still more the expression of a parochial attitude towards national life; but this attitude is disappearing with the growth of education, the improvement of communications and the advance of industrialisation. Before the war the centre of Slovakia was Turčianský Sv. Martin; but that was a small town of only 5,000 inhabitants, away from the chief transport artery. Situated in a poor and sparsely populated mountainous district, it offered favourable soil for a small group of Russophiles to put forward theories of particularism and racial purity, at a period when the Slovaks had not a single deputy and had no access to higher education and public life. In the whole of Slovakia there were only six towns which had more than 15,000 inhabitants, and they were to a large extent Magyarised: whereas in Bohemia alone there were 27 towns of that size, and half of them, especially the larger ones, were entirely Czech. The advance of Magyarisation, supported by all the strength of the Government, was so great that before the war a third of the Slovak population knew Hungarian. Oppression and poverty are responsible for the loss to Slovakia by emigration during the first two decades of the present century of almost 500,000, conditions which are somewhat reminiscent of Ireland. Religious conditions differ in Slovakia from those which obtain in the Czech lands (though in Bohemia even now after the great secessions following the war the Catholic Church has a larger percentage than in devout Slovakia), resistance to the soulless and bureaucratic centralisation which is the baneful legacy of Vienna being there especially justified. One particularly striking example of this centralisation was the wholesale transfer of the Austrian secondary school and university system to Slovakia and the absurd

exaggeration of the importance of German to the prejudice of other world languages

• We have sketched in rough outline the fabric of the political development. There remain to be said a few words on the present electoral system, which throws some light on the complicated political conditions of today, and mention must also be made of Provincial autonomy. The Socialists, who were in the majority after the revolution, extended, by agreement with the other parties, universal suffrage to women also, following the model of the German Reich. The franchise, however, was adapted more strictly to the needs of the parties. The lists of voters are posted up publicly and are revised twice yearly. Every voter is obliged to go to the polls under penalty of fine, but his freedom of voting is not entirely unrestricted, since party lists are drawn up and officially supplied to every voter and no erasures or alterations may be made in them. The system prevalent in Belgium and certain Swiss cantons is not permissible. The striking out by a voter of individual names on the list renders the voting paper invalid, that is to say, the list must be adopted in its entirety. As the country is divided into 22 large constituencies, and all the electoral lists must be supplied to every voter, this system is very expensive. If a new party fails to secure a mandate, it has to pay the very heavy expenses of its electoral list, and this militates against further splitting up into small fractions. The deputies are considered as employees of the parties and if they are unable in some questions to reconcile their conscience with the tenets of their party, they are excluded from it and at once deprived of their mandate by an electoral court consisting of party delegates. This arrangement has developed since the constitution of 1920, which in accordance with the previous practice of constitutional states, forbade deputies from accepting orders from anyone. The power of the existing parties however quickly outgrew constitutional limits, and the creation of new parties has become almost impossible, because it requires very careful organisation, a popular daily Press and an exceedingly expensive apparatus.

This peculiar franchise has aroused dissatisfaction, because it has been introduced also into the provincial and district assemblies and even into local government. Communal affairs thus often become the subject of purely political considerations. Opposition to excessive political influence in local affairs and to compulsory voting and "bound lists" has on several occasions become an electoral slogan, but has not met with any great success, because the original parties have in the meantime won the deciding power and do not relax

their hold upon it. A striking feature is the paradoxical fact that the significance of provincial autonomy is greatly on the decline, although the franchise is now enjoyed by numerous classes, whereas before the War the electors were divided into electoral curiæ or colleges according to their taxable capacity, and universal suffrage was only employed for elections to the Vienna Reichsrat. On the other hand, the power of the bureaucracy and centralisation has enormously increased. After the Revolution even the provincial boundaries were abolished, though they had survived so many centuries of historical development and had successfully resisted the centralisation of Vienna. But the *Župa* system, which was then instituted, was in fact only carried out in Slovakia, and in 1927 the provincial system was revived. Slovakia, which had never before formed an independent unit, together with Carpathian Ruthenia, are now provinces with local assemblies.<sup>3</sup> As part of Silesia had, in deference to the demands of the Great Powers, been ceded to Poland, the remainder, being too small to form an entity of its own, was incorporated with Moravia.

The political evolution in the different provinces was too varied to allow us to follow it out in detail. Through the religious counter-reformation the Bohemian nation was degraded from the first position in its own country to that of a subject people. In the 19th century this evolution was completed through the growing struggle for freedom. The national awakeners placed hopes in the vast strength of Russia, who had displayed her might in the Napoleonic wars, but their political programme was first formulated in the revolutionary year 1848. The generation of the eminent publicist Karel Havlíček and the historian Palacký, "Father of the nation," failed to achieve its aims; and it was the Old Czech party, led by Dr. Rieger, which first of all inaugurated passive opposition, boycotting not only the newly-constituted Imperial Parliament at Vienna, but also the provincial Diets, in which the Viennese Govern-

<sup>3</sup> Czechoslovakia is therefore divided from an administrative point of view into four provinces. At the end of 1930 Bohemia had an area of 52,065 square kilometres with more than 7,100,000 inhabitants, Moravia with Silesia an area of 26,803 square kilometres with 3,500,000 inhabitants, Slovakia an area of almost 49,000 square kilometres with only 3,300,000 inhabitants, and Carpathian Ruthenia an area of 12,628 square kilometres with 720,000 inhabitants. If we wished, therefore, to make a comparison with England, we see that Bohemia and Moravia-Silesia (the historic lands of the Bohemian Crown) have a surface larger than half of England and Wales with less than a third of its population. The eastern part of the Republic—Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia—is less than half England with about one-ninth of its population.

ment had continued by arbitrary electoral manoeuvres to produce a German majority, especially in the Curia elected by the large proprietors (*Grossgrundbesitz*). The Old Czechs were, however, compelled by economic pressure to recognise the new state of affairs, and when they attempted to reach an agreement with the Germans such as would have destroyed the unity of the Bohemian Lands, they were completely shattered in 1891 by the Young Czech party. But the radical tactics of the Young Czechs, led by the brothers Grégr, and represented by the daily journal *Národní Listy*, very soon gave place to wavering opportunism. New social interests, especially the growth of an industrial working class and serious agricultural crises, led to the foundation of the Social-Democratic, and later of the Agrarian party. In the rising younger generation, educated at the new Czech University of Prague—the ancient Charles University, the oldest in Central Europe, had been Germanised up to 1882—new currents of thought made themselves felt. Thomas Masaryk came from Vienna to be professor of philosophy at the Bohemian University, and brought with him other views than those hitherto held by representative Czechs, and in conjunction with Kaizl, then professor of political economy, and with Dr Karel Kramář, became the founder of Realism. All of them speedily entered the Young Czech party, of which Kramář later became the leader, while Masaryk with little success tried to establish a party of his own. His programme in that period is contained in a collection of articles entitled "Our Present Crisis," which very decisively rejected Radicalism in politics, and his philosophy of history is set forth in a famous book on "The Czech Question" (1895). The former Realists, who had joined the Young Czech party, introduced changes into its programme in 1907, before the first elections for universal suffrage. They proclaimed a "positive policy" which reckoned with conditions as they actually were, and already the main question for them was the economic strengthening of the nation. The Young Czechs became increasingly the organ of the wealthy urban classes. But the younger generation did not approve of this development, and a large section of the more progressive students and of the working classes in the nineties were anti-Austrian and Republican. The Vienna Government employed stringent methods of persecution, suspension of newspapers, and exceptional tribunals, and at the monster Omladina trial a number of young men were condemned to nearly a hundred years' imprisonment. This movement, which styled itself Radical-Progressive, passionately proclaimed a programme of national rights, and its struggle for national independence.

was combined with one for the social emancipation of the working classes. Later, some of its members entered the Social-Democratic party, while the majority followed the leadership of Karel Stanišlav Sokol and Dr. Antonín Hájek. When in 1897 the first Social-Democrats were elected to the Imperial Parliament at Vienna and declared against the hitherto prevalent political programme of their nation, a new National-Socialist party was formed against them under Karel Křofáč. This comprised in the main State employees, minor officials, and local *petite bourgeoisie*, and acquired considerable influence among the working class after the coming of the Republic. The Young Czech party, which had at Vienna for a long time stood almost alone for the Bohemian cause, lost its position on the introduction of universal suffrage in the Austrian Parliament. This was brought about in 1906 and was due to the influence of the first Russian Revolution. Only 25 Young Czechs were elected, even including the Old Czechs, who had amalgamated with them, but nearly as many seats were won by the Social Democratic workmen. The Catholic party was powerful, the Radicals increased their numbers, but the largest number of seats fell to the Agrarians.

In a short article it is impossible to describe the pre-War evolution in detail. Neither the international excitement aroused by the annexation of Bosnia, nor the outbreak of the Balkan war against the Turks, in which the Czechs showed lively popular sympathy for the Serbs and Bulgars, nor even the imminence of a world war, availed to widen the narrow horizon of official Czech policy. Only the progressive party of Hájek issued on May 1914 a manifesto in several world languages, in which they vainly tried to draw attention to the international importance which the Bohemian question would very soon assume.

Two months later the world war broke out. The politicians of the big parties were astounded. But the popular instinct was not misled, and the Czech soldiers made it abundantly clear that their sympathies were on the side of the Entente in a contest which, according to the German Chancellor, was to be one between Teutons and Slavs. Soon the Czechs deserted to the Russians in masses. Professor Masaryk, whom the Zagreb high treason trial had already convinced that a progressive Austria was a vain illusion, succeeded in escaping abroad and laboured chiefly in the West. He soon became the leader of the Czech revolt, to which Czech and Slovak emigrants all over the world adhered, lending it their support in money and men. The largest number of legionaries came from



those who were taken prisoner by the Russians. Dr Karel Kramár considered that his presence would be required at home, the Russians were indeed near the Moravian frontier and had penetrated to the Carpathians. After their defeat at Gollitz the Czechs were brutally oppressed. Dr Kramár, Dr Rašín and others were condemned to death, but escaped their fate only because the outbreak of the Russian revolution altered the whole situation. There was a general feeling that the condemnation of these politicians was tantamount to condemning the whole nation, and a unanimous movement of opposition was conducted by Alois Jirásek and other writers. Quarrels between the parties were smoothed over, and the Bourgeois groups combined to form a new party of "constitutional democracy." Political opportunists such as the socialist, Dr Šmeral, were disavowed, and in 1918 the national revolt attained a menacing unanimity.

The external transformation began with the downfall of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy. On 28 October 1918 the reins of government were assumed by a *præsidium* of five members of the National Committee which had been earlier constituted from representatives of all parties. The Slovaks had been mercilessly thrust against the wall so that they could not make their voices properly heard, having at that time only two deputies at Budapest; their blood-brothers co-operated abroad with the National Council, led by Masaryk and his close colleague, Dr Beneš. On 1 May 1918, at a meeting of workmen at Liptovský Sv Mikuláš and again at a conference of the leaders in October, they announced agreement with the policy of the Czechoslovak nation and its union in a single state. The first National Assembly, which for the first eighteen months after the Revolution had the task of laying the foundations of the Republic, was not created as a result of special elections, but was merely an extended National Council, its members being appointed by the executive councils of the parties. Dr Kramár became head of the government. His National-Democratic party had 46 representatives out of 254, and its club embraced many authors and men of learning. But the first general elections of June 1919 showed so great a preponderance of the Socialist parties that the government was replaced by another under the leadership of the Social-Democrat, Tůsár. This received the support of the two Socialist parties and the Agrarians. Keen disputes arose over foreign policy, since Kramár was a partisan of intervention in Russia. When a constitution was agreed upon, general elections were ordered, though not throughout the whole country, since part

of Silesia was in dispute and a slice of Carpathian Ruthenia was still occupied by the Roumanians

Out of a possible total of 6,200,000 votes the Socialist parties obtained in April 1920 nearly 48 per cent. and the Czech Social-Democratic 1,600,000. The Agrarian party was about half as strong and had begun to organise in Slovakia also. then followed the two Catholic parties, the National-Socialist party and directly after them the party of Dr Kramář. The German parties were not represented in the earliest National Assembly, by far the most prominent place among them was taken by the German Social-Democratic party. The triumph of the Social-Democratic parties was not, however, of long duration

The German comrades agreed upon a very national programme and the Czechs were undermined by Bolshevik elements. At the time of the attack by the Soviet forces on Warsaw open conflict broke out in the party and this led to the resignation of the Government. After two years of a provisional regime (the authority being vested in a committee of the five Czech parties) a Cabinet under the Prime Minister, Dr Antonín Švehla, was formed. He was the president of the Agrarian party which had become the greatest organisation after the split of the Social-Democrat party. This all-national coalition passed many important laws, especially that on social insurance

In November 1925 new elections took place and this brought about a change in the existing relations of the parties. The Socialists gained more than 8 per cent. of the votes and the Catholic parties greatly increased. Slovakia, which had hitherto been dominated by the Social Democrats, was captured by Hlinka's Catholic party which announced a struggle for autonomy. National-Democracy was greatly weakened, chiefly through the Small Traders' party, which organised the shopkeepers and artisans whom rising taxes had menaced. On the German side the first position was secured by the German Agrarian party. Whereas the Communists succeeded in forming a block of almost a million votes, the Czech Social-Democrats fell to 630,000, although voting was then general over the whole country and the number of registered voters exceeded 7,000,000. The German Social-Democrats were also considerably weakened. The extreme fairness of the Republic was shown by the fact that the Germans obtained 75 mandates although, by virtue of their numbers, they were not entitled to more than 70. After two provisional Governments, two German parties, the Agrarians and the Christian Socialists, were added in 1926 to the

ruling majority and included in the Government. The new majority legalised the corn duties, raised the salaries of the clergy, adopted a measure of administrative reform, through which the state and autonomous administrations were combined, reintroduced provincial Diets or assemblies (from whose competence political affairs, however, were removed), further extended the law of social insurance, and withdrew the right to vote from the military and the gendarmerie. Socialist opposition could not prevent these changes. An extensive achievement was the uniform codification of the laws on direct taxes. The coalition was afterwards augmented by the adherents of Hlinka's party, which obtained two representatives to the government.

This parliament also was prematurely dissolved. At the elections in October 1929 the Communist parties were weakened and the Socialists gained. All the Catholic parties lost, as also the German Nationalists who still maintained opposition to the peace treaties. The Zionists succeeded in winning an entrance to parliament through combining their voting lists with the Poles in the Těšín area. It is of interest that the Poles have three deputies although they are entitled to only one on the basis of the number of Polish-speaking citizens within the state. After the elections a new government coalition was formed out of the parties of the existing majority and, although the German Christian Socialists and the Hlinka party fell away, there was a gain of 96 Socialist deputies (of both the Czech Socialist groups and also, for the first time, German Social-Democrats, who won a seat in the cabinet). The opposition is thus very heterogeneous, it consists of the parties not represented in the government, the Communists and the German and Magyar Nationalist parties. The economic crisis and the large amount of unemployment among the working classes give the Government no little trouble, since it is necessarily difficult to harmonise the interests of agricultural producers with those of industrialists and workmen in a country largely engaged in export.

In a country with a two-party tradition, such as England and the United States it is hard to understand a system under which, in a House of 300 deputies,<sup>4</sup> 19 parties and fractions are represented. This is why we have had to devote more space to an exposition of the

<sup>4</sup> Besides the Chamber of Deputies there is also a Senate with 150 members. The voters must be 26 years old and those elected must have attained 45 years. According to the original constitution the two houses enjoy equal powers, but in practice the Senate is generally set aside. Although it was laid down that the lower house should be elected for six years and the Senate for eight, so far both chambers have been dissolved simultaneously, thus preventing the possibility of any serious discord between them.

sociological conditions of party relationships and to historical evolution than to the parties themselves. In reality the differences between the parties are not so fundamental, except as regards nationality. Only the Communist Club contains deputies of all five nationalities.

Besides, there is a fundamental difference between the Socialist and bourgeois parties, the latter containing three elements—the peasants and farmers, the industrialists and traders, and the wealthy bourgeoisie and professional class.

A brief glance at the principal parties and their present strength will suffice. At the elections of October 1929, 7,385,000 votes were recorded in the Republic. The largest of the Czechoslovak parties is the Republican, formerly styled the Agrarian, led by Antonín Švehla (now in ill-health), who acquired great merits in the state after the revolution. The party endeavoured to bring about land reforms, a matter which has considerable political importance. Slovaks belonging to this party include Dr. Hodža and Dr. Štefánek. The Prime Minister Udržal is also an adherent. Its chief daily paper is *Venkov* (The Countryside). The party has steadily increased, and has 1,105,000 votes with 43 deputies. After the bourgeois parties comes in point of strength the Catholic Popular party, led by Monsignor Šrámek. Besides many less known papers it owns the important daily *Lidové Listy*. After the revolution, although the influence of the Catholic Church considerably declined, it succeeded by its dexterous policy in preventing the adoption in the constitution of the principle of the separation of Church and State. It demands church schools, such as have continued to exist in Slovakia from the earlier period. It has now attained 623,000 votes and has 25 deputies. In programme the Slovak People's Party, led by Monsignor Hlinka, is closely related to it. The latter obtained less votes than in 1925, but with its 20 deputies it is the largest party in Slovakia.

Its progress was crippled by the condemnation of Dr. Bela Tuka, one of its leaders and editor-in-chief of the daily *Slovak*, to 15 years' imprisonment for treasonable activities in the interests of Hungary. It is but fair to add that leading adherents of the party had not an inkling of this other side to his character. To the National-Democratic party belonged Dr. Alois Rašín, to whom is due the financial separation of the new state from Austria. He was mortally wounded by a young man of Communistic views in 1923. Its leader is Dr. K. Kramář, who at the negotiations in respect of the constitution defended the national character of the state; its organ is the *Národní Listy* (National Journal), the oldest of all Czech political journals.

The party obtained nearly 360,000 votes and has 14 deputies, the Traders' party has two less.

Two large Czechoslovak organisations are Socialist. The Social-Democratic party has now reached 963,000 votes, and as its club now includes Polish and Zionist representatives it has 43 mandates. Of the Czech parties it has the oldest organisation and has endured much persecution during its eventful history. Of its leaders the present Minister of Justice, Dr Meisner, was one of the chief authors of the present constitution and franchise, while Dr Winter is responsible for the scheme of social insurance. Thanks to the secession of the Communists, the party has lost the predominant position which it held immediately after the revolution, but at the same time it has drawn closer to the German Social-Democrats. Its daily is *Právo Lidu* (The People's Right). The second Czechoslovak Socialist organisation is the National Socialist party, formed by Václav Klobáček, but not resting on a Marxist basis. Under Austria it was persecuted for anti-militarist propaganda among the younger generation and was widely regarded as the party of youth. It acquired a more working class character after the revolution, when theoretical anarchists joined it, these were however excluded later. Dr Beneš, who has been Foreign Minister for thirteen years, entered it with his followers and has a special organ of his own, the *České Slovo*. His opponent, the former minister Jiří Stříbrný, who had great influence in the party, was excluded from it, and again returned to Parliament with the slogan of war against compulsory voting lists. The National-Socialist party steadily increased, afterwards obtaining 76,700 votes and 32 mandates.

Of the 300 deputies now sitting in the Prague Parliament 92 are of other than Czechoslovak nationality, the most numerous being the Germans. Accustomed as they had been in Austria to positions of power and the enjoyment of influence in court circles, the bureaucracy, nobility and army, it took a long time for them to find their level in such radically altered conditions. Many individuals among them soon realised that a standpoint of radical negation had absolutely no hope of success, and as has already been pointed out, certain German parties have now been represented in the Government for the last five years. The largest of these groups is the Agrarian, led by Professor Spina, of the German University of Prague, together with the remnants of the former Liberal party and a group which broke away from the Nationalists, it has gained 396,000 votes and 20 mandates. The German Christian-Socialists form a somewhat weaker party which at the last elections joined their voting lists.

to those of the German Traders' party. The German National Workers, working on parallel lines with the Hitler movement in Germany, won 204,000 votes and 8 deputies, and by their boisterous declaration in favour of German self-determination have out-distanced the old German Nationalist party. The leader of the latter, Dr. Lodgman, had already abandoned politics when he saw that activist currents among the Germans were leading to a recognition of the Republic and ultimately to participation in the government. The two Hungarian parties of Christian-Socialists and Nationalists obtained a quarter of a million votes and 9 deputies. But there are many Magyars among the Communists, and the Magyar Socialists form a special section of the Czechoslovak Social-Democratic party, (like the Polish deputies). The deputies from Carpathian Ruthenia, except one, are members of the various parties already mentioned.

The Communists obtained a total of 753,000 votes among all the nationalities and 30 deputies, and in Slovakia especially they far outnumber the Social-Democrats. This, however, brings them no practical advantage, since on principle they reject parliamentary and constitutional methods and their point of view is a negative one. But their noisy competition creates some difficulties for the governmental Socialists.

This survey is of an entirely general character. Those interested in detailed statistical data and historical information about the parties may be referred to a series of articles in this year's Annual of the Prague review, *Nové Čechy* (New Bohemia).

EMANUEL ČAPEK.

## NATIONALITY AND THE NEW CZECHOSLOVAK CENSUS.

ACCORDING to the first census of 15 February, 1921, the number of Germans in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia showed a decrease of 517,730, the number of Magyars in Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia a decrease of 315,979, as compared to the pre-war figures of 1910. When the results were published, doubts were expressed on the German and Hungarian side as to whether the census had been carried through correctly, and it was indeed difficult to believe that so large a number of Czechs and Slovaks had succumbed to the German and Hungarian political and economic preponderance in the old Dual Monarchy.

This decrease of Germans and Magyars was attributed to the alleged use of violent methods during the census, and attempts were made to prove that the new ethnographical data did not correspond to reality. The discrepancy between the results of the parliamentary elections of 1920 and the census of 1921 was made a basis for the assertion that the German population of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia had been curtailed by something like 220,000 persons. This theory was inaccurate, because it failed to take into account the fact that the Czechs, having relatively more children than the Germans, consequently had more non-voters and also that the percentage of absentees was higher among the Czechs.

A detailed analysis of the electoral and census results shows either complete agreement or only such small differences as can be easily explained. None the less, public opinion abroad was left with the impression that the national minorities had not been treated fairly during the census of 1921.

When preparations were being made for the second census of 1 December, 1930, fresh disputes arose as to the method of execution. The tactics of the minorities varied. The German political parties put forward in Parliament the claim that each nationality should have enumerators of its own. The Magyar deputies not only presented an interpellation, but also addressed a complaint to the President of the Council of the League of Nations (18 November, 1930) to the effect that the Government census instructions violated the freedom assured to national minorities, and requested that their case should be considered as an international issue and submitted for decision to the Permanent International Court at the Hague.

to those of the German Traders' party. The German National Workers, working on parallel lines with the Hitler movement in Germany, won 204,000 votes and 8 deputies, and by their boisterous declaration in favour of German self-determination have outdistanced the old German Nationalist party. The leader of the latter, Dr. Lodgman, had already abandoned politics when he saw that activist currents among the Germans were leading to a recognition of the Republic and ultimately to participation in the government. The two Hungarian parties of Christian-Socialists and Nationalists obtained a quarter of a million votes and 9 deputies. But there are many Magyars among the Communists, and the Magyar Socialists form a special section of the Czechoslovak Social-Democratic party (like the Polish deputies). The deputies from Carpathian Ruthenia, except one, are members of the various parties already mentioned.

The Communists obtained a total of 753,000 votes among all the nationalities and 30 deputies, and in Slovakia especially they far outnumber the Social-Democrats. This, however, brings them no practical advantage, since on principle they reject parliamentary and constitutional methods and their point of view is a negative one. But their noisy competition creates some difficulties for the governmental Socialists.

This survey is of an entirely general character. Those interested in detailed statistical data and historical information about the parties may be referred to a series of articles in this year's Annual of the Prague review, *Nové Čechy* (New Bohemia).

EMANUEL ČAPEK.



## NATIONALITY AND THE NEW CZECHOSLOVAK CENSUS.

ACCORDING to the first census of 15 February, 1921, the number of Germans in Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia showed a decrease of 517,730, the number of Magyars in Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia a decrease of 315,979, as compared to the pre-war figures of 1910. When the results were published, doubts were expressed on the German and Hungarian side as to whether the census had been carried through correctly, and it was indeed difficult to believe that so large a number of Czechs and Slovaks had succumbed to the German and Hungarian political and economic preponderance in the old Dual Monarchy.

This decrease of Germans and Magyars was attributed to the alleged use of violent methods during the census, and attempts were made to prove that the new ethnographical data did not correspond to reality. The discrepancy between the results of the parliamentary elections of 1920 and the census of 1921 was made a basis for the assertion that the German population of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia had been curtailed by something like 220,000 persons. This theory was inaccurate, because it failed to take into account the fact that the Czechs, having relatively more children than the Germans, consequently had more non-voters and also that the percentage of absentees was higher among the Czechs.

A detailed analysis of the electoral and census results shows either complete agreement or only such small differences as can be easily explained. None the less, public opinion abroad was left with the impression that the national minorities had not been treated fairly during the census of 1921.

When preparations were being made for the second census of 1 December, 1930, fresh disputes arose as to the method of execution. The tactics of the minorities varied. The German political parties put forward in Parliament the claim that each nationality should have enumerators of its own. The Magyar deputies not only presented an interpellation, but also addressed a complaint to the President of the Council of the League of Nations (18 November, 1930) to the effect that the Government census instructions violated the freedom assured to national minorities, and requested that their case should be considered as an international issue and submitted for decision to the Permanent International Court at the Hague.

As soon as the census was completed, there followed violent protests in the German Press, and various concrete complaints against the behaviour of certain enumerators were lodged. But the number and nature of these complaints in no way corresponded to the vehemence of the attack. More important were the attacks from the Hungarian side. The Deputy, Dr Géza Szullo, announced at a meeting of the Christian-Socialist party at Komárno, that the Magyars of Slovakia were submitting a detailed statement to the League describing all the alleged illegalities committed during the census. A former Hungarian Cabinet Minister, Dr Béla Foldes, an honorary fellow of the International Statistical Institute, published on 12 December, 1930, a letter to the President of this Institute, in which he strongly condemned the whole racial statistics of Czechoslovakia and the way in which the last census had been carried out, and appealed for intervention by the Institute.

The Czechoslovak statistics have also been criticised in England, where a question was asked in the House as to the illegal methods alleged to have been employed, while the *Daily Mail* dealt with the question in an article entitled "Czechoslovakian Folly." The aim of the present article is not so much to answer such attacks as to explain the principles on which our census rests and how it was carried through.

To ascertain the nationality of an individual is one of the most difficult statistical problems, and sociology has not yet found any generally accepted solution. Standpoints differ, and we are sometimes faced by the problem of defining the nationality not only of individuals, but even of entire ethnical groups, as for instance, the Alsatians in France, the Mazurians in East Prussia, the Moravians in Hlučínsko, etc. Until a single and uniform definition of nationality is agreed upon, there will always be controversies about it and about census statistics in general, and it would be wrong to accuse the census of inaccuracy and falsification, when there is only a different conception of what nationality means.

Statistical congresses have from the outset urged the view that in countries with mixed populations, account should be taken of both nationality and language. The question of racial statistics was discussed at the Congress of Petrograd, as far back as 1872. Its preparatory committee had asked for the opinion of three experts as to the meaning of nationality, and all three differed in their fundamental conception of the question. When therefore it proved impossible to reach a consensus of opinion on this point among the members of the Congress, it was unanimously agreed that

the "language spoken" (*langue parlée*) should be the guiding consideration. States with a mixed population accepted this decision, language remained the test until the end of the 19th century, and "language statistics" took the place of "racial statistics."

The method of ascertaining the language was not uniform, and the formula "langue parlée" was indefinite. No instructions or hints were given, as to how to define the language of persons who spoke two or more languages. In the majority of countries the mother tongue was accepted as the basis, but the definition of "mother tongue" was not uniform and there were considerable differences in interpreting the expression. In Austria the test was "the language spoken in daily life" (*Umgangssprache*), while in several other countries it was simply the "language," without any further definition.

Difficulties in determining the "mother tongue" of the individual prevented the formulation of definite rules. These difficulties have been clearly stated by the British Statistical Bureau with reference to the use of English and Welsh in Wales, where there could be no question of partiality. "It would have been difficult, if not impossible," says the official document of 1921, "to define within the limits of a question on the census schedule, a standard of proficiency capable of definite and general interpretation, and there will no doubt have been some lack of uniformity in this respect in the returns of different individuals. The replies may have varied, for example, according to the attitude taken with regard to the object of the enquiry, *e g*, as to whether it was intended to elucidate the extent of the habitual use of either or both languages, or whether it was designed from a literary or an educational standpoint."

Language is no doubt the most important test of nationality, but it is not always identical with it. There are nations who have preserved their national individuality, though they have ceased to speak their mother tongue—for instance, the Jews—and there are ethnical groups who differ in national feeling and consciousness from the nation whose language they speak.

When it came to be understood that language and nationality are not always identical, attempts were made to base racial statistics upon a direct acknowledgment of nationality and not of the language spoken. Bulgaria was the first among European countries to accept this new system, and as early as the census of 1900 nationality was recorded side by side with the mother tongue. After the World War some of the new States which have been formed on the territory of the former Russian Empire followed Bulgaria's example;

for in the old Russia the differences between language and nationality had been so frequent and striking as to draw the attention of the officials of the first Russian census in 1897

The problem of racial statistics is, however, not solved by merely putting the nationality on record. Nation and nationality are not identical conceptions, and indeed there are two antagonistic conceptions of the word "nation", namely, the ethnical, which lays stress upon the origin and is more of an historical nature, and the political, which sees the substance of a nation in the will to create the State as a political entity. Both points of view have been put into practice in census taking, in Soviet Russia and Bulgaria the racial origin of the individual is the decisive factor (ethnical nationality), whereas in Poland and Lithuania it is his "national consciousness" (political nationality). But we are not yet at an end of the difficulties about racial statistics. It still remains to decide whether the declaration of "subjective" nationality made by each individual is to be treated as final, or whether it is to be submitted to certain tests in the same impartial way as answers to other census questions. The preparatory theoretical work for the census is entrusted in Czechoslovakia to the State Statistical Council. It was obvious, that in a country with such powerful national minorities the census must take special account of racial statistics. But as there was no international agreement to decide the principles on which racial statistics should rest, the Council had no directive of this kind to follow. Moreover, statistical practice varied considerably in the different countries with national minorities, indeed, there are no two countries where language or nationality are recorded in the same way. Hence, before the first census, the Statistical Council had to lay down fundamental principles for its own guidance.

Its members unanimously rejected the system of recording the language "spoken in daily life" (*Umgangssprache*) adopted in the old Austria. The Austrian Government introduced this system in 1880 mainly for political reasons, in the calculation that very numerous "non-Germans"—chiefly Czechs—living on German territory would be compelled to acknowledge the German language as that which they habitually used. In this way the number of persons speaking German would naturally be augmented. Experience of successive Austrian censuses has proved that Czech objections to the "*Umgangssprache*" were justified, and that the fears that their own numbers would thereby be artificially reduced, were well founded. Professor Rauchberg, the German representative on the Czechoslovak Statistical Council and author of the book *Der*

*Nationale Besitzstand in Bohmen*, also opposed the "Umgangssprache" and favoured the mother tongue. In this he was following the example of all the leading German statisticians, who held that the mother tongue was the surest indication of a person's nationality.

When the "Umgangssprache" was rejected as a basis for statistics, another formula had to be found in its place. Before the war opinions differed, Czech public opinion demanded that the "mother tongue" should be substituted, as being a better criterion of nationality. But before the Census of 1910 the Czech deputies in Vienna demanded the inclusion of a rubric of "nationality," and on 23 June of that year Parliament decided that both "nationality" and "Umgangssprache" should be recorded.

In the State Statistical Council of Czechoslovakia opinions were divided between those who favour the "mother-tongue" and those who preferred "nationality". The chief motive which secured a majority for the latter was consideration for the Jewish minority. Not even the strongest supporters of the "mother-tongue" could deny that the Jews form in Czechoslovakia a national minority (their representatives secured two seats in Parliament at the last general elections), nor again could they disregard the fact that the language spoken by nationally conscious Jews does not correspond to their nationality. Besides, during the negotiations for the new Constitution a promise had been made to the Jews that they should not be compelled to declare themselves as belonging to any other nationality but their own, and this was naturally regarded as binding.

No sooner had a majority of the Council decided in favour of "nationality" than it was confronted by the further question: how to ascertain the nationality of each individual during the census. For anyone who conceives of nationality as a consciousness of belonging to a community bound together by common interests and feelings, there is only one possible method, namely, that every registered person should himself decide what is his own nationality, and that this declaration should be accepted without challenge or alteration.

This method however runs counter to the actual census technique. All data which are asked from the population at a census are subjected to control, and it is the function of official enumerators to make sure that all these answers are correct. Is there any way of ensuring that people declaring their nationality are speaking the truth? The Petrograd Statistical Council, basing its opinion upon the principle that only evidence susceptible of objective control could serve as a

basis of statistical research, unanimously reached the conclusion that "nationality based upon personal feeling" (or "subjective nationality") cannot be accepted for census purposes. The determination of nationality meets with the following obstacles:

(a) It is not everyone who has a definite national consciousness, and there are people who are not clear what nationality they belong to, or do not wish to belong to a particular nationality, or else vacillate between one or other

(b) A person acquires national consciousness only at a certain age and educational standard. Once admit the conception of "subjective nationality," and it follows logically that people who have not reached this intellectual level, and all children below a certain age, should be excluded from making this particular census entry

(c) Many people are subject to alien influences and are induced to give answers which do not correspond to the truth. It is an historical fact that whenever politics were introduced into a census, pressure was brought to bear upon those who were socially weak, economically dependent and lacking strong national consciousness, to give false answers. In districts with a mixed population, the knowledge that declarations of nationality cannot be controlled would lead to attempts to influence all those in dependent positions

(d) In order to eliminate this danger, the declaration of nationality should be made secret, according to the system adopted during elections in all countries claiming to be democratic. It was also suggested by some people that the declaration of nationality should be made on a separate sheet and then enclosed in a sealed envelope. This method, however, does not fit in with census technique, which does not aim at recording the wishes of the individual, so much as the social, religious, national and other conditions of the population.

After giving due consideration to the above arguments, the Statistical Council and the Government decided that the declaration of nationality should be based upon some controllable evidence, and the "mother-tongue" was recognised as falling under this category. Only in the event of some one ceasing to speak his "mother-tongue" and adopting another language would the latter take the former's place. Jews were allowed to return their nationality irrespective of their "mother-tongue."

The instructions as to registration of nationality, as formulated

anew for the second census, run as follows. "Nationality shall be recorded in accordance with the mother-tongue. Nationality differing from that indicated by the mother-tongue, may be recorded only if the registered person does not speak it either in his family or in domestic life and has a complete mastery of the new language. Jews, however, may always register Jewish nationality."

"One nationality only may be recorded. In the event of anyone recording two nationalities or none at all, his nationality shall be determined on the basis of his mother-tongue."

It should be added that the nationality of children under fourteen is decided according to that of their parents. If these are of different races, then according to that of whichever parent has charge of the children, in doubtful cases, according to that of the father, and in the case of illegitimate children, according to that of the mother.

This decision in favour of the mother-tongue met with the approval of the German minority. For instance, Ernst Kundt in the German National periodical *Der Weg*, wrote as follows:—"This" (namely, the determination of nationality in the case of children and adults), "imposes a definite legal check upon arbitrary action on the part of enumerators and upon rivalry between the nations, even though in practice a good many things might occur in spite of the penalties imposed." Professor Rauchberg, a leading German statistician and also a member of the Statistical Council, had already declared that the object of establishing the mother-tongue as the test of nationality was not to enable the officials to alter returns according to their free judgment, but on the contrary, to place bounds upon their arbitrary tendencies.

Only the Magyars of Slovakia demanded that everyone be allowed to record his nationality irrespective of the mother-tongue, notwithstanding that in Hungary the latter always was and still is the test. Hungarian statisticians are also of opinion that only controllable evidence may form the basis of a census. None the less, the Magyar deputies and Senators of the Prague Parliament submitted a memorandum to the League of Nations, complaining that they had been deprived of certain national rights by not being permitted to record their nationality in the manner desired. It is, however, clear to anyone who knows the state of affairs in pre-war Hungary and in present-day Slovakia, why the Magyar minority was so anxious to introduce the so-called "subjective nationality." There are still a considerable number of "Magyarone" Slovaks, belonging to the old Hungarian regime, which blocked all cultural development on the part of the non-Magyar nations. The Magyars thus hope

to swell their own numbers, whereas they themselves, being economically stronger, did not need the protection of any such impartial and controllable evidence as the mother-tongue affords.

The resolution that the mother-tongue should be the test of nationality does not guarantee impartiality in the census taking. Their experience of former Austrian censuses had taught the Czechs that satisfactory results depend not so much upon the formulation of questions, as upon preventing the exercise of any pressure upon socially weak and dependent people and guaranteeing the impartial behaviour of the census officials. It was known that in the old Austria the registration officers used to alter data according to their own judgment, for instance, in the case of officials of Czech nationality resident in Vienna their "Umgangssprache," though returned by them as Czech, was changed to German without their knowledge. Measures had therefore to be taken to prevent the possibility of similar occurrences.

In order to obtain true and reliable answers to the question about nationality, the Statistical Council—its German members included—unanimously agreed upon the following principles, which were then approved by the Government:—

(a) Section 20 of the Instruction expressly laid down that "data relating to nationality should be recorded regularly and strictly, no pressure whatsoever being allowed."

(b) If doubts arise as to the correctness of nationality returns in the schedule filled in by the head of a family, the enumerator shall question the person whose nationality he suspects of having been wrongly returned. This inquiry shall be made, if necessary, in the absence of the head of the family or other persons, in order to prevent any pressure on the part of the employer upon dependent members of the household (domestic servants, apprentices, lodgers, etc.).

(c) Should the enumerator ascertain that the nationality of some person, as judged by his "mother-tongue," differs from that recorded in the schedule, he is entitled to alter these data, but only with the consent of the person concerned—such consent to be given in writing on the schedule itself. This regulation was intended as a guarantee that the enumerator would neither act arbitrarily nor alter data according to his own information and judgment.

(d) Should no mutual agreement be reached, and should the enumerator still insist that the declared nationality is



not the true one, he shall submit the whole matter to the District Political Office, which shall then inquire into the case and take a decision according to the ascertained facts. Anyone who is dissatisfied with this decision shall have the right to appeal to a higher legal instance.

(e) Data entered in the schedule by the enumerator himself may only be based upon statements made by the party concerned, on his own behalf or on that of members of his family who are under age. If the official does not consider these answers to be correct, he shall submit the matter to the Political Office.

These regulations were denounced by the Magyars as "vexatious." It may freely be admitted that they may in some cases seem vexatious, for no law in the world is exempt from all possibility of abuse. But they were definitely introduced in order to guarantee to everyone a free declaration of nationality, immune from any outside influence or pressure whatsoever. The best testimony of the Statistical Council's good intentions is to be found in an article of Professor Rauchberg in the leading German daily, *Prager Tagblatt*, expressly stating that the Instruction published by the Government proves the Council to have done its utmost to assure correct returns.

It is, however, obvious that good laws do not suffice unless they are well carried out. Complaints had been brought forward from the German and Hungarian side that the census was aimed against national minorities. These related to three main points: (a) the type of schedule or return sheet selected for use; (b) the appointment of enumerators according to nationality; (c) the behaviour of the enumerators. On this the following observations may be made —

(a) The census had to be taken by means of schedules filled in by the head of the family or one of its members, or else by means of return sheets filled in by the enumerators. Which of these two methods was to be chosen, had to be decided in accordance with local conditions and the ability of the population to fill in the forms. Still the opinion is widespread that freedom to declare one's nationality is better guarded when everyone fills in his own form. When German and Magyar complaints came to be investigated, it was proved that more enumerators' return sheets had been used in the Czech districts of Bohemia, Moravia and Silesia, than in the German districts, and thus the German complaints appeared unjustified. It is true that these same sheets had been universally

used in Slovakia and Carpathian Ruthenia. This, however, was not due to any national or political reasons, but to the fact that a considerable portion of the population in both provinces, and especially in the latter, can neither read nor write

(b) Enumerators and controllers were not chosen from the Czechs and Slovaks only, but from the minorities also. There are precise statistics to show that 23·06 per cent of the enumerators employed in Bohemia were of German nationality and 17·56 per cent in Moravia and Silesia, while the number of enumerators of Magyar nationality in Slovakia and Ruthenia was respectively 594 and 187. These figures prove that the number of enumerators and controllers did not entirely correspond to the proportions of the respective nations, but the main reason for this was the lack of German or Magyar enumerators with a satisfactory knowledge of Czech and Slovak.

(c) It was the duty of enumerators to make sure whether nationality had been recorded according to instructions, that is, on the basis of the mother-tongue (except in the case of the Jews). It often happens in provinces of mixed population that people change their language and nationality, and arguments are bound to arise as to the nationality of certain persons, in cases where the process of denationalisation has not yet been completed. The Minister of the Interior has declared on the basis of precise statistics, that the total number of cases of contested nationality amounted to 1,340 in Bohemia, 1,135 in Slovakia, and 172 in Ruthenia, no data were as yet in his possession for Moravia and Silesia. These figures may surely be dismissed as insignificant. The Minister also added that it was unusual for the nationality of a born German or Magyar to be contested; disputes invariably related to persons of Czech or Slovak origin, whom the Germans and Magyars claim as theirs.

The full results will in themselves be the best evidence of the accuracy of this second census in Czechoslovakia, and there exist a number of secondary means of testing the accuracy of the racial statistics obtained. So far, we only know the results of the enumeration in Bohemia, and these prove that the Census in this province has been taken well. It would be absurd to deny that there may have been abuses in single cases on the part of enumerators (irrespective of

## NATIONALITY AND CZECHOSLOVAK CENSUS. 115

their nationality), and there have doubtless been individual attempts to influence the results by artificial means. But these were exceptional cases such as no country can altogether avoid, and whenever proved, they have been corrected officially.

The Statistical Council of Czechoslovakia and its Government have done their utmost to arrive at unimpeachable statistical results, and I am convinced that their efforts have been successful.

ANTONIN BOHÁČ

## THE UKRAINIAN QUESTION IN POLAND.

THE March issue of this *Review* contained two articles dealing with the Ukrainian question, the authors of which, Mr Paneyko and Professor Srokowski, were to give respectively the Ukrainian and Polish points of view on the actual state of the Eastern Galician question. The fact that the authors of the two articles worked under the disadvantage of not knowing each other's intentions is probably responsible for their main arguments being at cross purposes, and it may perhaps be useful to fill in the gaps and to submit to readers of the *Slavonic and East European Review* a more detached view on the subject, as formed by actual contact with the realities of the problem.

If we consider the practical aspects of the Eastern Galician problem, and inquire into its origins and developments up to the present day, we shall discover that both Polish and Ukrainian students of the subject are usually only too prone to plunge far back into the dim past of history. No Pole writing on the subject ever fails to quote from the *Chronicles* of Nestor, the father of Russian and Ukrainian history, who recorded that it was from the Poles—and from no other nation—that in the year 981 of the Christian era, Vladimir, Prince of Kiev, wrested this province. Every Ukrainian, on the other hand, usually glosses over this event and prefers to discourse at great length on the power and glory of the pageant of all the other Vladimirs, Yaroslavs, Daniels and Levs. Incidentally, this may serve to remind us that many leading Polish families are descended from those princely ancestors. As a respecter of ancestry, I make bold to assert that not one of them worked for the creation of an Eastern Galician problem, and that its origins as a practical political question are much nearer to our own days, and that it developed under the eyes of living generations.

It was a hot August night of 1920 when several Bolshevik armies were advancing on the Vistula, and when the City of Warsaw was reverberating with the roar of guns, that a member of the British Legation called at the Polish Foreign Office on behalf of Mr Lloyd George's Government and advised the Poles to capitulate. Had this advice been accepted, we may safely assume that quite irrespective of the events which occurred in the province of Halicz between the 10th and 19th centuries, or during the war and after the Armistice,

there would hardly be any mention of Eastern Galicia today. The Polish-Soviet frontier would have been established along the rivers San and Bug, and the Cheka would be shooting Ukrainian patriots in Lwow and Przemyśl instead of shooting them in Kharkov and Kiev, without creating thereby any "problem" whatever and without troubling the collective conscience of Western Europe.

The battle of Warsaw decided the present frontiers of Poland, imposing upon the Government of the republic the responsible duty of administering certain territories, among them the territory called "Eastern Galicia," inhabited by a mixed population. I am describing Eastern Galicia as a territory of mixed population not because it is inhabited by Poles, Ruthenes, and Jews, or by Catholics of the Roman and Uniat rites and by Hebrews. There are many instances where people of different languages or religions live side by side without being impressed with the stamp of a country with a mixed population. No one will classify the United States of America under such a heading, though it swarms with religious sects and though its citizens differ from one another even in the colour of their skin.

Nor again can Eastern Galicia be described as a country inhabited by three distinct national groups, separated from one another by impenetrable walls of religion, tradition, habit, custom and usage as was the case, for example, with certain medieval towns where Greek, Genoese, Venetian and Armenian quarters existed side by side, yet separated from each other in the same way that oil and water are separated although enclosed in the same vessel.

Eastern Galicia is a country with a mixed population in the literal meaning of the word, where every individual living in the territory and born in it of parents settled there has in his veins, regardless of his professed nationality, a mixture of Polish and Ruthene blood. Consequently, we have to deal with a mixture of blood in each individual inhabitant, and not with a confused mingling of members of different nationalities on one territory.

Indeed, statistical researches point to the fact that about one-third of the inhabitants *living at present* in Eastern Galicia are descended from marriages in which one member belongs to the Polish and the other to the Ruthene nationality, or to the Roman and Uniat rites respectively. This fact cannot be disregarded by anyone attempting to find a practical solution of the problem. The position may be summed up by stating that although it is true that there exist in Eastern Galicia two religious rites—both within the tenets of the Roman faith, and two languages, both very closely

related and mutually influencing each other, and again two (or even three, if we distinguish between Ruthenes and Ukrainians) distinct nationally conscious groups—it is equally true that there exists only one race, one people. The fact that this race originated from a mixture does not detract from its uniformity, there exists the Anglo-Saxon race, but only one English nation, which is uniform, although it evolved from a mixture of Celts, Teutons, Normans, and Scandinavians speaking each their individual language.

Polish and Ukrainian students indulge in futile disputes as to which of the nationalities composing the population of Eastern Galicia is indigenous to the country and which are colonists. Personally I am not interested in the dispute as to whether the Poles were wronged, because in A.D. 981 Vladimir the Great conquered their territory, or whether the Ruthenes were the losers in 1340 when King Casimir the Great of Poland expelled the Mongols from the province of Halicz (Eastern Galicia). I do not think that a man whose ancestors have for centuries inhabited a country can be regarded as a colonist, and I am sure I shall not offend anyone if I assert that both the nationalities which compose the people of Eastern Galicia are indigenous to the land. In any case, since the whole population of the territory of Halicz (Eastern Galicia) is of mixed Polish and Ruthene blood, every man who is a “colonist” through his father may be “autochthonous” through his mother and may with equal justice consider himself either, according to his own inclination.

This does not, however, mean that I underrate or belittle this senseless feud which for two generations has antagonized the children of one soil, a feud which has lately become very acute and the further aggravation of which is desired by some and feared by others. The stupendous waves of thought flowing through the minds of men are often illogical; and the more illogical and sentimental they are, the greater may be their force. Even homogeneous nations are sometimes subject to psychological convulsions pregnant with disputes and internal difficulties. The 16th and 17th centuries have given us many examples of what differences in religious opinions may lead to, even within the most homogeneous nations. We are still ignorant of the formulas of mental chemistry which operate in the living laboratory of history under the mysterious influence of which various ethnic elements sometimes amalgamate into one nation and sometimes disintegrate into their component parts; it is like the continuous fusion of copper and zinc into bronze, and the disintegration of bronze back into copper and zinc. The

White and Blue Nile become one stream, and after flowing through a vast expanse of country, split up again into the network of waterways which forms the Nile Delta. Yet there are streams whose waters after being divided by an upstanding rock in the river-bed, flow together again after encircling the obstacle in their course. It is difficult to imagine a greater internal division than that which existed in Germany after the Thirty Years' War, or that through which England passed under Charles I, yet these upheavals subsided when the spirit that caused them ceased to feed the discordant flames. The conflicts of opinion concerning the foundations of faith and morality which were the cause of internal divisions in the 16th and 17th centuries were really of far greater import than the matters which cause the divisions in Eastern Galicia.

When after the healing influence of time the religious fervour abated, a little good-will and tact sufficed to establish a peaceful and equitable existence of the most diversified religious creeds within the limits and under the protection of a common government. This process was rather slow in Great Britain, yet at the present time the only outward trace of former intolerance is the fact that Roman Catholics are barred from the Succession and from the office of Lord Chancellor. Why should we assume that philological nationalism, a creation of the 19th century, is an eternal and immutable phenomenon? Must we necessarily follow its blind, irrational doctrine and, grammar in hand, draw the frontiers of states flying in the face of history, geography, economics, and strategy, and of the very laws of common sense?

The theory that there really are territories where the intermixture of language and religion is so intense as to make territorial divisions impossible, has by now become generally accepted. Consequently, in dealing with such territories there are only two possible solutions, the first is the Assyrian method resuscitated by the League of Nations, the method of mass exchange of populations from their age-long habitations; the second is the search for practical measures to ensure the peaceful and friendly existence on a common territory of racial groups using different languages, measures that have been successfully carried out to assure the peaceful existence of various religious creeds.

The process of classification of the Eastern Galician people into its component parts is nearing completion. Poles, Ukrainians and Ruthenes will soon establish clearly defined claims to possession which neither side will be able to question. In this way an end will be put to the absurd yet harmful and scandalous statistical quarrels

over alleged secessions or desertions of individuals from one party to the other and to the consequent stigma attaching to "Poles of Greek Catholic religion" and "Ruthenes of Roman Catholic religion" respectively. There will be established a firm and recognised claim to possession not only as to Poles and Ruthenes—but on the Ruthene side itself the status of possession of Ruthenes with Ukrainian nationalist leanings and of Ruthenes of a non-Ukrainian—that is to say—"Old Ruthene" consciousness. For Ukrainian nationalists are mistaken when they proclaim themselves to be the only representatives of the Galician Ruthenes. The fact that they are not, ought to be emphasised in the interests of truth.

The Ukrainian movement in the territory of Eastern Galicia began to assert itself in the second half of the 19th century, the so-called "Old Ruthene" movement is much older and goes back to the early years of the 19th century. It was a movement which had nothing to do with Ukrainian ideals, though it accentuated a certain separatism in relation to the Poles. This movement, persecuted by the old Austrian government and even by the Polish administration of the country prior to 1914 for its Russophil tendencies, was up till 1918 represented by one fourth of the Ruthene deputies to the Austrian Parliament and the Galician Diet. At present it seems to be reviving with a somewhat different complexion.

The Ruthene deputies in the Warsaw Sejm vote as a rule with the Polish against the Ukrainian deputies from Eastern Galicia; in fact the feeling between them and these Ukrainian Ruthenes seems to be more bitter than that between the Galician Ukrainians and the Galician Poles. The process of stabilisation of the Ukrainian and the non-Ukrainian national cultures among the Ruthenes in Galicia is by no means completed, and, though for the moment, the preponderance is undoubtedly on the Ukrainian side, the future may still have surprises in store.

At any rate the stabilisation of the national cultures of the interested parties may be regarded as a favourable development, as it will result in establishing clearly defined units whose character and scope of interests will be known. This in turn will work for equality of treatment and render a reasonable compromise between them possible.

The lack of a well-established Ukrainian national culture and consequently the non-existence of clearly defined Ukrainian interests has always been a fatal obstacle to the development of Ukrainian nationality, for it prevented the shaping of what may be termed the Ukrainian *raison d'état*.



## THE UKRAINIAN QUESTION IN POLAND. 121

It cannot be denied that for several decades past there existed a national Ukrainian movement conscious of its distinctiveness from both the Russian and Pole. This movement gathered strength in the early years of the present century and flared up rather violently in the years 1918-1920, the heyday of Wilsonian ideals and doctrines. The practical manifestations of this movement, however, have not as yet passed beyond the stage of chaos and anarchy. The Ukrainians have developed certain purely negative activities to demonstrate their enmity to both Russians and Poles, but they have not as yet been able to embark on any constructive policy for the practical realisation of what appears to be the ultimate object and goal of every nationalist movement, namely the establishment of an independent State. The Ukrainian politicians proclaim—and I do not doubt their sincerity—that an independent Ukrainian State is their ideal. Ideals, however, are not realised by mere dreaming, desiring or complaining! A great deal of hard constructive work must be done, friends gained, every advantage secured from existing circumstances. The Ukrainian nationalists have no doubt been dreaming of a Ukrainian State, but it must be said that they have done practically everything in their power to frustrate the fulfilment of this ideal.

Looking at matters from a purely practical point of view, their struggles against the Poles in Eastern Galicia in the period 1918-1919 could have resulted only in giving the Bolsheviks time to conquer Kiev and Ukraine and to establish themselves firmly on that territory. The war with the Bolsheviks for the independence of the Ukraine was fought, in the first place not by the Ukrainians but by the Poles, who, in 1920, undertook the expedition against Kiev, during which the Dnieper Ukrainians played the rôle of auxiliaries, while the Galician Ukrainians did their best to oppose them by fighting on the side of the Bolsheviks. The experience gained in those years proved that the creation of an independent Ukrainian State is an impossibility, the Germans attempted it in 1918 and the Poles in 1920, but both attempts failed.

After the Polish victory in 1920 the Soviet Government decided to call that part of the Soviet territory by the name of the Ukraine and to proclaim their Soviet doctrines in the Ukrainian language. We know, however, that all the apparent administrative and constitutional liberties that were granted to Ukraine, were from the very outset considered by the Bolsheviks to be merely temporary expedients and are now being unostentatiously annulled, while Ukrainian nationalists who take the "Ukrainian" character of the

Kharkov Republic too seriously are being mercilessly put to death by the Bolsheviks. As regards Eastern Galicia, Soviet Ukraine has ceded it to Poland as easily as it had been ceded before by the bourgeois Ukraine under the leadership of Petlura. The Dnieper Ukrainians definitely refuse to unite with the East Galician Ruthenes. Consequently Eastern Galicia remains a part of Poland, as it had been since the year 1340. Even the Austrian régime (1772-1918) did not make any changes except that the so-called Ukrainian problem became more acute under the rule of the Habsburgs, who, by applying the well-known principle *divide et impera* did much to develop and instigate Ukrainian nationalism against the Polish part of the population.

I do not think that the Poles can be blamed for remaining in possession of a province to which they are indigenous, which furnished three out of their four native elected kings—Michael Wiśniowiecki, John Sobieski and Stanislas August Poniatowski—and the possession of which was not disputed by any of the neighbouring States, not excepting the White and Red Ukrainians, a province which Poland herself saved in 1918-1920. I think that the Poles were acting within their own rights in maintaining the *status quo* which had existed for six hundred years. Least of all can the Poles be blamed by those who calmly watched the rule of the Cheka in Kiev, and who were in favour of the same rule being established in Warsaw in 1920.

The question may be asked whether the maintenance of the *status quo* in the province of Halicz (Eastern Galicia) can be considered to have wronged the Ukrainians. There can be but little doubt that they lost nothing by it, for it is hardly possible to lose anything by the perpetuation of a state of affairs which has existed for six hundred years. Another question which may arise is whether they would profit by a change. It is not at all easy to answer this question in the affirmative. There is no Ukrainian State on the other side of the Polish frontier, but only one of the many Soviet Republics, a fraction of a new world which one day may or may not emerge from the Communist cauldron as the home of a new psychology and a new civilisation. This may never come to pass, and the Soviet Republic may, by all appearances, remain for a long time to come the home of anarchy, chaos, ruin and moral prostration. Whatever the future may have in store, there cannot be any doubt that the happenings in Soviet Russia up till now have been in the nature of experiments the results of which still remain to be seen.

Until these results are known, would it be desirable from the point of view of the Ukrainian *raison d'état* to thrust the whole

## THE UKRAINIAN QUESTION IN POLAND. 123

Ukrainian people into the Bolshevik melting pot, to be subjected to all the processes of Red chemistry? From the Ukrainian point of view it is surely a blessing that the Galician Ukrainians are separated from Soviet Russia by the Polish frontier and adequately protected by the power of Poland. They are not risking anything, for should the Bolshevik experiment turn out a success and the Soviet Ukraine become the model for mankind to follow, or at least the realisation of the Ukrainian national ideal, they will always be able to strive after it, or imitate it. Should, on the other hand, the Bolshevik experiment result in failure, or make it apparent that a lasting national civilisation cannot be built up on Soviet ideals, will it not be the mission of the Galician Ukrainians to prepare conditions of their national development based on the ideals of Christian and European civilisation? Can anybody imagine that the Ukrainians can facilitate such a development by fighting the Poles? On the contrary, their senseless attacks on the Poles, which quite recently have proved so disastrous to the Ukrainian national cause, can only exhaust the strength and energy of the Ukrainian community in fruitless endeavours. Nay, those attacks, by their very nature, are prone to debase the national character, when acts of common banditry are being tacitly or overtly palliated as legitimate efforts for national rights. Like all civilised nations, the Poles dislike assassins and incendiaries, and I am sure no one will blame them for this abhorrence of futile violence. Like every other country, Poland has her Chauvinists and other people who are incapable of drawing the right conclusions from the phenomena of life around them, who harbour the illusion that the current of history will cease to flow, that the nationalist Ukrainian movement in Eastern Galicia will sterilise itself or that the Ukrainians will eventually become "assimilated." On the other hand there are many Poles who consider the existence of the Ukrainian people to be an advantage for Poland and sincerely desire to see them happy and prosperous. There are Poles who recognise that the future of Poland and of Central Europe lies in a right solution of the problem of peaceful co-existence on nationally mixed territories of various nationalities with full equality of rights.

The man who in 1920, as the Head of the Polish Republic led the Polish armies to Kiev can by no means be called an enemy of the Ukrainians, and this man is said to wield at present practically unlimited power in Poland. The Ukrainians living within the Polish Republic have great possibilities before them, but they must at last emerge from the maze of romantic dreams and get down to positive work, taking into account the existing conditions of life in

order to achieve practical results, since politics are but the art of achieving results

As it happened, up till now it was only the Poles who have been trying to foster Ukrainian interests. In 1920 they attempted to create against the will of the Galician Ukrainians a national Ukrainian State, and when this effort failed, by pushing the frontiers of the Soviet world away from the rivers San and Bug they gave to a large fraction of the Ukrainian people the possibility of working out an alternative solution in the event of the anticipated failure of the Soviet experiment. Unfortunately it cannot be said that the Galician Ukrainians knew how to utilise the opportunities which Poland created for them during the last ten years. As an optimist, however, I hope that the influence of time and a definite crystallisation of the national character of Eastern Galicia will make the Ukrainians give up their romantic policy of complaints and grievances inspired by *émigrés*. Then the time will come to find the formula for the solution which will safeguard a peaceful and friendly co-existence of two different nationalities on one territory, with full equality of rights. I would say more, this formula has already been found and we may hope that before long the psychological attitude of the Eastern Galician community will become sufficiently mature to accept it. It looks as though the period of useless nationalist struggle were nearing its end, and as though minds will bring themselves to accept the ideals of peace and co-existence of nationalities, just as they were able to accept the ideals of co-existence of religious creeds.

In conclusion I would like to address a few remarks to the British friends of the Ukrainian nation, all those Englishmen of good will who sincerely desire to help forward the stabilisation of conditions in Central and Eastern Europe. During the last few months the attention of British public opinion has been turned to Eastern Galicia through the events which took place on that territory in the period between June and September 1930, *i.e.*, the so-called campaign of sabotage and the so-called "pacification" which followed it. The sporting characteristic of the British is that they instinctively sympathise with the side which they consider weaker; consequently, there arose a certain tendency to sympathise with the complaining Ukrainians, who were supposed to have suffered on the territory of Eastern Galicia from an unusually severe persecution by the Poles. The truth is that in several districts of the counties of Lwow and Tarnopol the so-called Ukrainian Military Organisation committed a series of criminal acts, chiefly of arson; appeals on the Polish

side to those Ukrainian leaders who consider themselves to be the representatives of the Ukrainian people, appeals invoking public opinion to exert its influence to stop criminal sabotage, proved of no avail. It became imperative as the first duty of the Government to restore the security of public life and property even by mechanical means, and of necessity this was done in a rather drastic manner, though with respect for human life. The effect was instantaneous, and the campaign of sabotage ceased.

It does not follow that Poles like "dragonnades," just as it does not follow that the British administration in India is bloodthirsty because it was forced lately to resort to the use of arms, and the imprisonment of thousands of Hindus, among them men of such international repute as Mahatma Gandhi. A Government cannot permanently and unconditionally give up the prerogative of using force in case of necessity. Had the British administration in India not displayed energy and strength, there would have been no Round Table Conference, and India today would be ablaze with civil war and social revolution. Poland, too, is conscious of her duties to herself and to the peoples living on her territories, and she will fulfil them.

*Niemce, Poland.* May, 1931.

STANISLAS LOŚ.

## POLISH SELF-HELP UNDER PRUSSIAN RULE, 1886-1908.

Now that Poland has regained her independence it is perhaps interesting to look back twenty years and recall some of the methods followed by the Poles to keep alive their national feeling and to combat the attempts of their masters to break down Polish resistance.

In the year 1908 two important measures were directed against the Poles in Germany, namely, the Polish Expropriation Bill, which passed through the Prussian Parliament after considerable opposition, and the Associations Law, which was carried through the Reichstag

At the time surprise was expressed outside Germany, and difficulty was found in adducing an adequate reason for forcing these two highly-contentious measures through Parliament, but the truth was that the National parties in Germany viewed with increasing concern the solidarity of national feeling among the Poles.

The history of the partitions of Poland, and of the Polish nation during the fifty years preceding the last partition, seemed to show that the Poles were a feckless, quarrelsome people, who found it impossible to agree amongst themselves, and who could therefore be safely regarded as a more or less negligible quantity in the countries whose subjects they had become since the dissolution of the Polish kingdom

In Austria, Germany, and Russia there was a population of 13,350,000 Poles, the majority of whom inhabited those provinces which anciently belonged to the Kingdom of Poland. Naturally the three Empires in question could not afford to disregard the aspirations of so large a proportion of their subjects; and when those aspirations tended to an attempt, however remote, to re-establish the independence of Poland, their alarm was easily aroused. The Poles in Austria numbered about 4,250,000, but Austria was experienced in governing a heterogeneous collection of races, and her Polish subjects were more or less contented. The Russian Poles made two efforts to regain their independence by force of arms, but they were unsuccessful, and after the last Polish insurrection Russia ruled Poland like a conquered country. The Prussian Poles numbered less than the Polish subjects of Russia and Austria, and a

rising on their part would have had no chance against the Prussian army, but they never supported Prussian government, or according to their ideas, Prussian misgovernment, with patience, or abandoned the idea of their nationality.

During the first three-quarters of a century following the Congress of Vienna in 1815, the Poles in Prussia were powerless for active opposition, and all their efforts were centred on keeping the flame of their national feeling aglow. About the beginning of the century they succeeded in evolving an organisation giving them sufficient power to afford them a chance of successfully combating the efforts of the Prussian Government to turn them into Germans. Doubtless the firm administration and the spread of education in the Polish provinces which followed their annexation to Prussia contributed in some measure to the strength of the Poles. At the time of the annexation, and for long after, the Poles were divided into two classes—the nobility and the peasantry. The former consisted of a small number of great landlords and a more numerous class of squires or minor nobles, from whose ranks the clergy were mainly drawn, the rest of the population consisted of ignorant and semi-barbarous peasants. No professional or trading class existed. There were no Polish doctors, lawyers, merchants, or tradespeople, and this class was entirely monopolised by Germans and Jews. With the spread of education a Polish middle class sprang up, and the Germans and Jews were gradually crowded out. Also the Poles gained ground against the Germans in the matter of numbers, owing to the greater fertility of Polish over German women, and to the immigration of Poles from Austria and Russia into Prussia.

It was only during the last years of the 19th century that the Polish question began to appear to the average German to be one of first importance, calling for strong and energetic measures. Polish nationalism was, nevertheless, none the less active during the first three-quarters of the 19th century, but it was only in 1893 that the Poles hit upon the plan which proved so successful, and caused such anxiety to the Germans.

The history of Polish nationalism from 1831 to 1914 divides itself into three periods. The first, from 1831–63, may be termed “the period of the exodus.” After the abortive rising in Russian Poland in 1831, the defeated Poles who would not accept the Russian amnesty, emigrated to France, for it was made clear to them by the Prussian and Austrian Governments that an increase in the number of Poles subject to those States would be unwelcome. Until 1863 the headquarters of the Polish organisation had its seat in Paris,

where it existed in the shape of the Polish Central Committee. After 1864 the headquarters shifted from Paris to Berlin, and the scheme for forming a Parliamentary group to further Polish interests which at the same time should be the centre of the Polish movement arose. The leaders of the Poles consequently came to Berlin and endeavoured to lead their party from there. It was during this period that the energetic anti-Polish policy of Prussia began. In the early eighties Bismarck instituted the "Kulturkampf," and Cardinal Ledochowski, Archbishop of Posen, was the first prelate in the German Empire to suffer under the anti-Catholic measures introduced by the Government. In 1886 the "Ansiedelungskommission" was founded, and the policy of buying out the Poles began. After the fall of Bismarck, Count Caprivi adopted a policy of conciliation towards the Poles, which lasted from 1890-93. In the latter year the headquarters of Polish nationalism again shifted, and the third phase of the struggle began. The Polish leaders hit upon the plan of transferring their centre to Posen, and there organising their compatriots into a sort of separate commonwealth, or *imperium in imperio*, to resist the Prussians. This scheme was crowned with a large measure of success, and the organisation evolved enabled the Poles to develop their nationality energetically.

Some brief description of this complicated organisation may still be interesting. The idea underlying the Polish scheme was that, when the time came and political circumstances permitted the Poles to free themselves, it would be necessary, in order successfully to make use of the opportunity, that Poles should beforehand gain possession of as large a proportion of the land in the Polish provinces as possible, that Poles should largely predominate in the population, and that the control of the commercial and agricultural resources of the country should be in Polish hands, so that when the opportunity presented itself, the assumption of political supremacy should not be the first step towards independence, but the last— independence in every other form but political having been acquired before. Thus the object of the Poles was first to secure economic independence and numerical predominance, in order that these might lead to political independence when the moment was ripe. While keeping the object of gaining economic independence in the foreground, the ultimate object was, of course, not to be lost sight of, and every effort was made to foster the national spirit among the Poles, and to inspire every Pole, however humble, with the idea of the "Loslösung des Polentums vom Deutschtum." The Poles had no material interest, and it is almost true to say no amusement,



which did not afford them an opportunity of forming a union or club for its furtherance

The organ by which they hoped to capture economic predominance was by means of the Economic Unions. These were therefore the most important of the Polish Unions, and also the best organised and the most widespread. They consisted of three types, but the object of all was the same, namely, to render the Poles economically independent of the Germans. These three types were (1) the Credit Unions ("Kreditvereine"), (2) the "Rolnks," or Agricultural Unions ("Genossenschaften für die Landwirtschaft"), and (3) the Land Purchase Unions ("Parzellierungs-Genossenschaften"). The central authority of these Economic Unions was the "Genossenschafts-Verband," or Union of Unions, and the pivot on which all turned was the "Patron," who was practically all-powerful in the Polish financial organisation, and, being so, the most influential person in the whole party. The Patron in 1908 was the Provost of Mogilno. His nominal power as Patron was but limited. He was merely the President of a Committee of seven persons, in whose hands the government of the Union of Unions lay. In theory he could be overruled by his colleagues, and even removed from office; but the "Prelate," as he was known in Poland, so imposed his will upon his colleagues that his word was law throughout the Unions, and he thus, through them, practically controlled the policy of his party.

The fact that the "Patron" was a priest opens an interesting point in the organisation and history of the Economic Unions. Their foundation was in no way due to clerical activity. The first leaders of the Unions were merchants, doctors, lawyers, and journalists; but by degrees more and more priests became leaders of the 200 Unions of Prussian Poland. The Unions were not confined to the Polish provinces, they existed among the Polish industrials in Westphalia and the Rhineland. The central point round which the Polish economic system revolved was the United Bank or "Bank Związku Spółek Zarobkowych," which was intimately connected with the Economic Unions. Next in importance to this bank was the Industrial Bank, and the connection was maintained by the leading spirits in the government of the Unions being also prominent in the management of the banks. Thus, of the seven members of the governing body of the Union of Unions, three were members of the governing body of the United Bank, one curator of that institution, another a director, and a third its legal adviser.

Such were the financial organisations of the Prussian Poles.

Next in importance came the Agricultural and Industrial Associations, namely, the Peasants' and Workmen's Unions and the Union of Landlords. For the purpose of the Peasant Union, Polish Prussia was divided into twenty-six communities, each of which was under the control of a Vice-Patron of the Peasant Unions. The central authority lay in the hands of the Patron of the Unions, with headquarters at Posen. In order to keep in touch with the whole organisation the Patron continually travelled throughout the district, taking part in all the assemblies and conferences, and thus keeping in personal connection with peasantry. The twenty-six Vice-Patronates were divided into about 300 Unions, each of which was ruled by a President. Each Union held a monthly meeting where the affairs of the Union were discussed. Every year the peasants in each of the twenty-six districts held a general meeting, and there was also an annual general meeting of the United Peasants' Unions held at Posen every spring. To this meeting each of the Unions sent its President and one other elected delegate. Delegates from the Economic Unions and other Polish bodies were also admitted to this assembly, which took place, as a rule, in the second week in March, and was held at the same time as the Polish Central Landlords' Union held its annual general meeting. Thus a regular agricultural "week" took place at Posen at this time, and those interested in agriculture from all parts of the country had an opportunity of meeting.

The Peasant Unions were intimately connected with the Economic Unions by the "personal tie" which bound all the various institutions of Poland together, and was the main principle of the Polish "Commonwealth." By the "personal tie" was meant the fact that all the leaders of the various organisations (as has already been shown in the case of the Union Bank and the Economic Unions) were leaders of other organisations at the same time. Thus the Vice-Patrons were nearly all of them leading men in the Economic Unions, and the Peasant Unions were bound to the Economic Unions in the same manner that the banks were.

Similar to the Peasant Unions were the Workmen's Unions. These were entirely under clerical control, and were founded by the clergy of the Diocese of Posen and Gnesen in order to further "the religious and moral interests of the Polish industrials." Each Union was under the leadership of a member of the clergy, nominated by the central authority of the Arch-diocese; and the Unions were joined together by a central authority, the most important official of which was the Secretary-General. The "personal tie" by which

these organisations were bound to the other Unions lay in him, and he was also a member of the governing body of the Economic Unions.

Similar to the Workmen's Unions were the Commercial Unions (*Gewerbe Vereine*) and the Merchants' Unions (*Kaufmannische Vereine*). These were also connected with the general system by the fact that prominent members of the Economic Unions, such as the Director of the Industrial Bank, were members of the central authority which ruled the "*Gewerbe Vereine*" and the "*Kaufmannische Vereine*."

The Union of Landowners was, like the Peasants' Unions, an Agricultural Association, but it was of immensely less importance than the peasant organisation. At the commencement of the movement for the institution of Unions among Poles the landlords held aloof and would have nothing to do with the matter, but gradually they began to see their error, and, although hostile to the organisation of the people in principle, they saw that they were obliged to move with the times. A small number of landowners formed themselves into a Union, and gradually this body was joined by others, till the Union numbered the majority of the Polish landlords of Prussian Poland. The bond of connection with the other Polish organisations was the President, who was a member of the governing body of the "*Związek Zieman*," or Land Unions—a Land Purchase Union, connected with the Economic Unions, whose members were mainly drawn from the large landowning class.

Next in importance after the Economic, Agricultural, and Industrial Unions came an organisation, which in its way had, perhaps, more influence in the maintenance of the Polish national spirit than any other. This institution differed from the others, in that its ostensible object was not profit but recreation. It was called the "*Sokół*," or Gymnastic Club. The "*Sokołs*" gathered the people together for recreation, but in reality they were organs of political and national propaganda of great importance. These gymnastic clubs existed not only in Prussia, but throughout the whole territory which anciently formed the Polish Kingdom, and also in other parts of Germany to which Poles had emigrated in sufficient numbers. The "*Sokołs*" were organised under a central administration called "*Verband der Sokol-Vereine*." The governing body was mostly drawn from among the Polish merchants, lawyers, and doctors of Posen, many of whom were connected with the Economic Unions, by which means the "personal tie" was maintained and the "*Sokołs*" connected with the other Polish organisations.

The last organisations, and, indeed, the least powerful, were the purely political. In 1905 a League was founded, called the "Straz" (Sentry), which was to unite all the Polish interests in Germany into one organisation. The whole of Prussia inhabited by Poles was for the purposes of the League divided into "Starostwa" presided over by a "Starosta," who directed the operations of the League within his sphere, and reported his proceedings annually at the assembly of the "Starostas" of the "Straz" in Posen. The governing body consisted of five directors, assisted by a council of eighteen. Both directors and council were elected triennially by the assembly of "Starostas," and over the whole was placed a President, who, with his secretary, really directed the operations of the League.

The Polish parliamentary elections were manipulated by a carefully organised committee known as the Central Polish Election Committee. For the purposes of elections to the Reichstag and the Prussian Landtag, the Poles were divided by the committee into four divisions —

1. Posen.
2. East and West Prussia.
3. Silesia.
4. The Poles in the Rhineland, Westphalia, Hanover, and Berlin.

The Central Committee charged itself with all business connected with elections to the legislative bodies of Germany and Prussia.

Such was the somewhat complicated system of the Polish Unions. I have touched but briefly on the internal organisation of each. My endeavour has been to show that each phase of life had its Unions, how all the Unions had a political objective, and how the leaders of the Polish national movement who were, comparatively speaking, but few in number, occupied leading positions in all the Polish Unions and Leagues, and that it was consequently the personal and unofficial tie that formed the bond to unite the Polish organisations into the so-called "Commonwealth."

All the various Unions were governed by Central Unions assembling at Posen, and the members of the governing bodies served in various Central Unions at once, but the Unions were bound together by a still closer organisation, which was entirely private and unofficial, but, nevertheless, most powerful. This body was known as the "Government," and was constituted as follows. —

1. The Patron of the Economic Unions
2. The Director of the United Bank.
3. The Director of the Industrial Bank.
4. The Patron of the Peasant Unions.

- 5 Two Vice-Patrons of the Peasant Unions
6. The President of the Central Union of Landowners
7. The President and Secretary of the Workmen's Unions
- 8 The President of the " Sokół's "
- 9 The President of the " Straz "

To these were added some prominent members of the clergy, such as bishops and archbishops, and some members of the higher nobility. Among the latter the " Government " always included one or two members of the Zółtowski family.

Thus the " Government " consisted of some fifteen to twenty men, united by no official tie, yet representing all the elements of the Polish nation.

The national solidarity of the Poles, and especially the cordial relations existing between the upper and lower classes, was largely furthered by the Educational Unions, of which there were four:—

- 1 The Marcinkowski Union
- 2 The Educational Union for Girls in West Prussia.
3. The Educational Union for Girls in Posen
- 4 The West Prussian Union for the furtherance of education

Of these by far the most important was the Marcinkowski Union, founded some 100 years ago by Karol Marcinkowski, a Pole who emigrated to Paris, but subsequently returned to his native country with the idea of founding Unions for the improvement of his compatriots' position.

The object of the Union was to afford a means of acquiring a secondary education to those who could not otherwise afford it. Its members were drawn from the Polish industrials and peasants, and it enabled members of those classes to become doctors, lawyers, journalists, etc. It is largely owing to the efforts of this Society that the German and Jewish elements have been ousted from the professional class in Poland and a Polish middle class built up.

The frequent reference to the part played by the clergy in the movement will have shown the great influence which was exercised by them in its leadership; and it may therefore not be uninteresting to attempt to give some idea of the position of the Polish ecclesiastics with regard to the German Catholics, and the part played by the Church in the Polish national movement.

It has been said that the Poles never really gave any trouble to the Prussian Government until Bismarck attacked their religion at the time of the " Kulturkampf." But the Polish national movement did not date from the time of the " Kulturkampf." The attack made by Bismarck on the Catholic religion no doubt incensed the

Poles against the Prussians and gave an impetus to the national movement. It also drove the Poles and the German Catholics into each other's arms in defence of their common faith. The first sufferer under the May Laws of 1873 was Cardinal Ledochowski, Archbishop of Posen, and he was followed by German Prelates, such as the Bishop of Trier, the Archbishop of Cologne, and others. In the early eighties the "Kulturkampf" died out, and the bond between the Poles and the German Catholic or Centre party gradually dissolved. After the active hostility to the Catholic religion had been relaxed, the Centre gradually became more a political than a religious party. The clergy of the two races in the Polish provinces took the side of their nationalities, and the idea of a National Church arose among the Poles. This attempt to form a Polish Catholic Church naturally did much to assist the cause of Polish nationalism, but there was a peculiar element in the ecclesiastical situation in Poland which gave this movement in favour of a National Church a particular importance.

This was the claim of the Archbishop of Posen to the Primacy of Poland—not only of Prussian Poland, but also of the Polish provinces of Austria and Russia. The claim was an old one and had always been disputed, and it had lapsed for many years. It was revived by Cardinal Ledochowski, and was utilised by the Polish leaders as a centre for rallying the nation. Dr. Stablewski, Archbishop of Posen, died in November, 1906, and afterwards no successor was appointed in his place. The appointment should have been made in the following manner. The Chapter of Posen prepared a list of candidates which it submitted to the Prussian Government, who selected someone for nomination, the nomination was then submitted to the Vatican for confirmation. The fact that no successor to Stablewski was nominated was doubtless due to the difficulty experienced by the Prussian Government in finding a suitable person according to its ideas. In the choice of a candidate it was in all probability much influenced by the Prince Bishop of Breslau, Cardinal Kopp, a German of the Germans, a Conservative and a thorough-going anti-Pole. During his long reign at Breslau he pursued a consistently anti-Polish policy—with some success at times—but on the whole the Poles got the better of him, and his attitude towards the Poles put the finishing touch to the division between them and the German Catholics. Thus the Poles became separated from the Germans in religion as well as in race, largely by the action of the Germans themselves; and the idea of a Polish National Church gained strength and power. The action of the

Centre party and the Catholic clergy in the eastern part of Prussia did as much to drive the Poles back upon themselves in religious matters as the repressive measures of the Prussian Government stimulated them to resistance in the fields of commerce and politics.

An example of the power of the clergy in animating the Poles to oppose the Prussians was the school strike. Stabilewski supported the strike in a pastoral letter in 1906, and it received the strenuous support of the clergy. The efforts of the Prussian officials to oblige the children to receive their religious instruction in German merely enforced on the younger generation, at an impressionable time of life, the conviction that the Germans were the irreconcilable enemies of the Poles. The enforcement of religious teaching in German was a foolish and vexatious measure, and it was, moreover, an illogical one, since religious instruction in French was allowed in Alsace-Lorraine. It did considerable harm to the Prussian cause, for it not only made the Prussian officials appear as tyrants, but it also exposed them to ridicule.

Besides the religious bond and the organisation of the Unions, there was another power which rendered aid of no mean kind to the cause of Polish nationality. The Polish Press was well organised and, in the cause of nationality, unanimous. There were some 140 newspapers published in Polish in Prussian Poland, and also several produced in other parts of Germany where there was an appreciable Polish population. The same sentiments pervaded all the Press, but they were served up differently to suit the various classes of readers. The greater newspapers, such as the *Dziennik Poznański*, catered for the educated classes, but "yellow" newspapers, pure and simple, existed in large numbers, whose sole business was to inflame the lower classes against the Germans.

Closely connected with the Press was the "Towarzystwo Czytelni Ludowych," or Public Libraries Company, which sustained public libraries in Poland, and supplied them with books calculated to inspire the spirit of Polish patriotism.

It is interesting to recall the weapons which the Polish "Commonwealth" used to combat the Prussian domination, the methods it applied, and the success it attained. The object of the Poles was to secure to themselves the proprietorship of as much land as they possibly could, in order to be numerically superior to the Germans in the ownership of Polish soil, for this purpose the chief agencies were the Land Purchase Unions. It is unnecessary to examine at length the system of land banks and credit which facilitated the acquisition of land by the Poles. It will suffice to quote the figures

given by the "Ansiedelungskommission," established by the Prussian Government to colonise Poland with Germans, and to hinder the acquisition of land by the Poles. The Commission was established in 1886, and a fund of £17,500,000 voted to its credit. In 1908, from the commencement of its activity the Commission had altogether acquired some 6,673,000 acres of land which was colonised by Germans. But the Poles acquired through the Land Purchase organisations 247,000 more acres of land from Germans than the Commissioners had purchased from Poles. Hence the Poles gained a distinct advantage in the battle for the land, and their territorial proprietorship, in spite of German efforts, had increased between 1886 and 1908.

The reason for this was the power of the Polish Unions and the excellent management of the Land Purchase organisations. The policy followed by the Polish leaders not only inspired their fellow-countrymen with patriotic and anti-German feeling and drew them together to resist Prussian policy, but it had also so improved the economic condition of the Poles that they obtained the necessary wealth to purchase the land coming into the market. In contrast to the Poles, the conduct of the German landowners was purely self-seeking. They utilised the fight between the Poles and the Commission to fill their own pockets. They played one off against the other, and sold their land to the one which offered the highest price. The Commission, therefore, instead of acquiring land from the Poles, in the main, only purchased land from Germans who threatened that, unless the Commission bought it, it would be sold to Poles. The Press played a large part in the battle for the land. A watchful eye was kept on all Polish proprietors, and anyone who dared to sell his land to a German was immediately the object of violent attack in the Polish Press.

The second weapon made use of by the Poles was the control of the labour market. Every year a large immigration of Polish labourers took place from Austria and Russia. These men worked on the estates of the German landowners, and without them owners of estates would have been ruined, for they would have been unable to obtain sufficient labour to cultivate their property. Hence, if the Poles stopped the flow of Polish labour into Prussian Poland, they could render the colonisation scheme impracticable by ruining the colonists. The only possibility, then, would have been for the Commission to break the land up into small holdings which could be cultivated by one pair of hands; but the difficulty of this would have been to recruit colonists in sufficient numbers.



The third weapon was the boycott of German goods and German merchants. Everything German was systematically boycotted, and the Press described commercial transactions between Poles and Germans as a "heavy crime and scandal." Those who dealt with Germans were pilloried in the papers in the same manner as Poles who sold their land to the "Ansiedelungskommission." In the market towns pickets were stationed outside German shops in order to prevent Poles from dealing with them. Papers like the *Dziennik Poznański* and the *Goniec Wielkopolski* of Posen, published lists of Polish and German tradespeople, so that there should be no excuse for any Pole not knowing the nationality of the business with which he dealt. The boycott was not confined to Germany, but was followed also in Russia and Austria, and boycotts of German goods frequently took place in Russian Poland.

In order that the boycott should be successful it was, of course, necessary that a sufficiency of Polish shopkeepers should exist in order to afford Polish buyers with an alternative to the German shops. This question was dealt with by the Polish leaders by a system of colonisation. Wherever a German business was in a more or less flourishing state, a rival Polish concern was started, which, assisted by the boycott, usually succeeded in ruining its German rival.

Such was the Polish National Organisation in 1908 when I knew Germany. The time is now past for these activities, but the organisation and successful maintenance of a system of so complicated a nature against the efficiency of Prussian bureaucracy should not be forgotten.

ONSLow.

## EARLY RELATIONS BETWEEN ENGLAND AND UKRAINE.

Down to the beginning of the 17th century, we do not meet any materials on Anglo-Ukrainian relations. Direct relations of course there could not be, as Ukrainian territory was at first under Lithuanian and then Polish sovereignty. English travellers were then in general very rare in the Polish-Lithuanian state and did not go as far as Ukraine. Certainly, the 16th century is the one in which British relations with Moscow developed. England at that time had a monopoly there; but in that period Ukraine had little in common with Moscow. The journey from England to Moscow was made by the Baltic and White Seas; the Black Sea was jealously closed by the Turks.

All the same the first information on the Cossacks of Ukraine came to England through Turkey. The Cossacks, who gave much trouble to Turkey, then very powerful in Christian Europe, could not fail to attract the interest of English students of Turkey. Richard Knolles (1540-1618) for instance, in a serious work on that period, *The Generall Historie of the Turks*,<sup>1</sup> which appeared in 1603 and had great success,<sup>2</sup> gave the English reader most interesting information on the Cossacks of Ukraine and on their naval expeditions to the coast of the Ottoman Empire.

Through Constantinople, too, British diplomacy for the first time took an active interest in Ukrainian questions. As is known, in the 1620's Europe was divided into two coalitions, a Catholic and a Protestant. Poland was on the side of the Catholic Habsburgs, and naturally the whole anti-Habsburg league gave serious attention to the Orthodox Ukrainians in Poland, whose armed vanguard was the Cossacks.

British diplomacy could not fail to know that the Papal Nuncio in Warsaw, de Torres, in 1622 reported with mortification: "It is impossible to take forcible measures against the Orthodox, for this is prevented by the Cossacks, a warlike and brave people standing watch over the freedom of faith, now with appeals, now with threats

<sup>1</sup> London, printed by Adam Islip, p. 40.

<sup>2</sup> In 1638 was published the 5th edition.

in their mouths, but always with weapons in their hands. What may some time come out of these threats, it is easy to guess if we take into account that there are about 60,000 Cossacks and that they . . . at convenient times do enormous harm, especially in a country like Poland that is open and without fortresses”<sup>3</sup>

This was also taken into account by Protestant diplomacy, which in addition in 1620 had to do with the Cossacks as an auxiliary corps in the army of the Habsburgs that devastated Silesia and Moravia.<sup>4</sup>

So, one after another, the members of the Protestant league begin to get connections with the Cossacks in the hope of destroying the Polish State with their help. Oxenstiern, the famous Chancellor of Gustavus Adolphus of Sweden, in his instructions of 7 August 1623 to his envoy in Holland, John Rutgers, writes that the King hopes for the help of the Orthodox Ukrainians in Poland.<sup>5</sup> As the Hague was then in close touch with London, British diplomacy must certainly have known of the hopes of Gustavus Adolphus.

Another member of the Protestant league, one who was still more intimately connected with British diplomacy, also came into connection with the Ukrainians. This was the famous Transylvanian Prince Gabriel Bethlen. A man of great statesmanship and wide political conceptions, Bethlen clearly saw the chronic weakness of the Polish state and was very much interested in Ukraine. In one of his talks with Paul Strassburg, envoy of Gustavus Adolphus in Transylvania, Gabriel Bethlen gave a remarkable exposition of the Ukrainian question which does honour to his foresight. “Many sensible and distinguished persons have been studying the question whether the Zaporog people, brought to extreme despair by prolonged oppression, may not leave Poland, recognise the protection of neighbouring sovereigns and form an independent state. There are some who think that the people of the Zaporogs is most famous by its origin and ancestors . . . So we must not only use the present occasion, but also in the future it would be well to attract to our common action such outstanding and brave fighters . . . The Patriarch of Constantinople, Cyril, . . . is now at once summoning the Cossacks to stand firm for the cause of God . . . Envoys of the King of England and the Dutch envoy . . . persuaded the Patriarch

<sup>3</sup> Relacye nunciuszów apostolskich i innych osób o Polsce od roku 1548 do 1690. Berlin 1864, II, p. 150.

<sup>4</sup> Theatrum Europæum 1634, I, 343, Hurmuzaki, Documente privatoare . . . V, part I, 600, A. Moslach, *Przyczynko do dziejów polskich z Arch. miasta Wrocławia*, Poznań, 1860, p. 58, 156, 158.

<sup>5</sup> Rikskansleren Axel Oxenstiernas skrifter och Brefvexling. Stockholm 1888, I, 584.

to do this, and he has solemnly promised to stand with loyalty and truth for the common weal''<sup>6</sup>

The Patriarch of Constantinople, on whom the English envoy laid such hopes in the Ukrainian question, was the famous Cyril Lukaris, one of the most distinguished figures in the gallery of Orthodox hierarchs who fought Catholicism<sup>7</sup> A student of the University of Padua, Lukaris for a long while travelled about Western Europe, lived in Geneva, where he entered into close relations with the Calvinists, later was Professor of Greek in the Bratstvo School of Vilna, lived with the famous Ukrainian cultural worker, Prince Constantine Ostrozhsy, also visiting Lwów, until in 1612 he became Patriarch of Constantinople Having strong sympathies with the Calvinists, Lukaris is intimately connected with two brilliant Protestant diplomats on the shores of the Bosphorus, the Dutch Ambassador, Kornelis Haga, and the British, Thomas Roe. The latter was also particularly closely connected with Bethlen

Thomas Roe (1581-1649) carefully studied the position in Ukraine, and possibly he was the inspirer of the Ukrainian plan of action, which was worked out by Lukaris, Gabriel Bethlen and Strassburg It is more than possible that researches in Roe's dispatches in the Record Office will give new data on the Cossack policy of England At present we have to be content with the work which appeared in 1740 in London under the title *The Negotiations of Sir Thomas Roe in his Embassy to the Ottoman Porte from the year 1621 to 1628 inclusive: A great variety of curious and important Matters relating not only to the Affairs of the Turkish Empire, but also to those of the Other States of Europe, in that Period.* . . now first published from the originals<sup>8</sup>

In this book there are reports of Roe which show what an interest the British Ambassador took in the Cossack customs and their manner of waging war. Thomas Roe is also connected with the name of the celebrated Samuil Koretsky, the hero of Ukrainian songs. Married to the daughter of the Moldavian Hospodar,

<sup>6</sup> The Latin original of the report of Strassburg giving Bethlen's exposé is printed in the Hungarian *Történelmi Társ.* 1882, pages 272-4, and in Russian in the archives of South-Western Russia, part III, vol. 6, pages 28-30, in Ukrainian in Ivan Kripyakevich, *Cossackdom in Political Coalitions*, 1620-30, Lviv, 1914, pp. 12-14

<sup>7</sup> The vast bibliography of Lukaris is collected in the work of E. Legrand, *Bibliographie hellénique*, Paris, 1896, Vol. IV.

<sup>8</sup> Folio, LXIV, 828, a fragment in the collection of Niemcewicz'sa *Zbiór pamiętników historycznych o dawnej Polsce*, Vol. V, 1830, under the title *Wyjatkę z negocjacyj kawalera Sir Thomas Roe w czasie poselstwa jego do porty ottomańskiej*

Koretsky, at the head of the Cossacks, helped his father-in-law against the Turks and was taken prisoner. Shut up in a castle on the Bosphorus, Koretsky, by a whole series of clever devices, escaped from captivity, but in the battle at Tsetsopa, which was so disastrous to Poland, he fell into the hands of the Turks. In the name of the King of England Roe begged the Sultan for the life of the brave Ukrainian knight but was opposed by the Grand Vizier, who was furious because the Cossacks had made a daring attack by sea on the castle where Koretsky was imprisoned. On 27 June, 1622, Roe informed his government of "a new and awful step of the barbarians." The Turks strangled Koretsky, "the defender of Ukraine," "the Sarmatian Leonidas," as he is called in contemporary literature of the Panegyrics and in Ukrainian popular songs, beginning as early as the 17th century, Koretsky is celebrated together with another Ukrainian hero, the founder of the Zaporog Fastness, Prince Baida-Vishnevetsky, who was also tortured by the Turks in 1653. Popular poetry later even confused the two Ukrainian heroes.

Buv Pan Koretsky  
 Dmitro Vishnevetsky  
 Vin nebesnu silu mav  
 I voiovav gromom  
 Ta svoim slovom . . .<sup>9</sup>

In the history of Anglo-Ukrainian relations, the personality of Thomas Roe is always emphasising itself side by side with Samuil Koretsky,<sup>10</sup> whom, on the initiative of the British diplomat, the King of England took under his protection and even had a definite promise of the Turkish Government, but, as Roe writes, "here no one thinks of keeping his word."

About the end of the 1620's and the beginning of the 1630's, Oxford and Cambridge had with them as a student the later well-known Ukrainian statesman Yuriy Nemirich, the creator of the Swedish-Ukrainian alliance of 1657, a friend of Charles X, whose friendship was also sought even by Louis XIV. Nemirich, whose name is written in golden letters in the history of Ukrainian culture, was in his youth a Unitarian, studying the humanities in Protestant universities and afterwards in Paris and Padua. In the last-named,

<sup>9</sup> This song is given by Edward Rulikovsky who wrote it in 1853 in the district of Vasilkov, near Kiev. M. Voznyak, "Chikava pam'yatka ukrainskoi pisenosti 17go viku," in the periodical *Ukraina*, Kiev, 1929, III-IV.

<sup>10</sup> In the celebrated poem of the Bubrovnik poet Gundulic, *Osman*, one of the chief heroes is Koretsky. Cf. A. Jensen, *Gundulic und sein Osman* *Ein sudslavisches Literaturstudie*, 1900.

Nemirich is entered in the university records on 17 June, 1632, as "Georgius Niemirycz ex Belgio, Britannia, Gallys hospes in itinere adhuc conficiendo"

What was feared by the Papal Nuncio in 1622, what was foreseen by Gabriel Bethlen, what had engaged the activity of Thomas Roe, at last came about in 1648, namely a great Ukrainian revolution under the leadership of Bogdan Khmelnitsky. We can easily imagine the deep interest which was aroused in Europe by the Ukrainian national and social revolution. Unfortunately, as far as England is concerned, no systematic work on this subject has yet been done in the English archives.

However, we know the interest which was excited in the English press by the Ukrainian revolution. As early as 14 December, 1648, *Le Mercure Anglais*<sup>11</sup> gave a detailed description of the battles of the Yellow Waters and Korsun, where, in the words of contemporaries, "Poland lay in dust and blood at the feet of the Cossack". Another paper, *The Moderate Intelligencer*,<sup>12</sup> in the course of 1649 gave interesting information from Ukraine, where the revolution was in progress. The geographical and political Manual *A Book and Map of all Europe, with the Names of all Towns of note in that Known quarter of the World*,<sup>13</sup> gives data about the chief towns of Ukraine and knows of the changes which had taken place there after the Revolution. The Treaty of Pereaslav between Ukraine and the Tsar of Moscow, which ended so disastrously for the first-named, was made known in the London paper *The Weekly Intelligencer of the Commonwealth*<sup>14</sup> as early as 16 April, 1654.

All who are even superficially acquainted with the Ukrainian revolution of 1648 know the name of Maxim Krivonos, one of the most terrible lieutenants of the Hetman Khmelnitsky. He was a cruel leader, with whom not a single Pole ever found mercy. He destroyed and ruined for the sheer love of ruining, and on this ground Krivonos came more than once into conflict with Khmelnitsky, a real statesman for whom the Revolution was not an end in itself but a means of organising an Ukrainian state. Krivonos, on the other hand, was a living incarnation of so-called permanent revolution, a brilliant demagogue who could only too well play upon the destructive instincts of the mob. In the end Khmelnitsky, after long efforts, succeeded in getting rid of Krivonos, who vanishes from the

<sup>11</sup> By John Cotgrave, London, 4to. It appeared in 1644 on Thursdays.

<sup>12</sup> By John Dillingham, London, 4to.

<sup>13</sup> London, 8vo, p. 206.

<sup>14</sup> Printed by R. Austen, 4to.

Ukrainian stage without leaving any documentary traces of his enigmatic disappearance

Who exactly he was, no one, right up to the present day, has succeeded in establishing "Krivonos" was of course a pseudonym originating in the crooked nose of the leader, with which contemporaries also drew him in portraits. Krivonos appeared in Ukraine on the very eve of the Revolution. It is curious and extremely suggestive that not one of the leaders of the Revolution was so closely followed abroad as Krivonos. The *Gazette de France*, it is true, offers us fantastic information about him, giving great significance to reports of his mortal wound in November 1648. The Papal Nuncio with pleasure specially informs the Holy See of the conflicts of Khmelnitsky with Krivonos,<sup>15</sup> and the Swedish Chancellor Oxenstiern obtains exact information about him through his agent in Danzig.

The riddle of the personality of Krivonos must perhaps be sought in a now very rare pamphlet in German which appeared in 1649 under the title *Grundliche und denckwürdige Relation der newlichen Cosaken Revolte wider Cron Polen . . . unter Commando Gen Chmielnicki als Gen Hauptmann, Pultorock Cosaken-Obristen und Krziwanos, Obristen, des vornemsten Hauptern der Cosacken, von Anfang bis zur newlichen (Gott sey Lob) unverhofften Friedenscomposition, so hiebey gefuget, und darauffer theilten Konigl. Pardon, nach bewusten und zum Theile selbst erfahrenen Umbstanden kurtzlich verfasst durch einen namhaften Offizirer, jedoch dabey des Friedens Liebhabern*<sup>16</sup>. The author of this pamphlet with such a long title was a certain German officer in the service of the Hetman of Lithuania, the well-known Jan Radziwill, who on the one hand for a short time took Kiev away from Khmelnitsky and on the other, being chief of the Lithuanian autonomists, kept up secret relations with the Ukrainian Hetman. And this German officer, who was well informed by the nature of his service, writes: "*Der Gen Major Krziwanos ein gebohrner Schott, von wegen seiner Krumen Nas also von den Cosaken genant, sonst ein resolvirter und ver-*

<sup>15</sup> Collection of Materials on the *History of South-Western Russia*, Kiev 1916, issue II, 113

<sup>16</sup> S I. 4to, p 12 "Full and notable account . . . of the recent Cossack revolt against the Polish Crown . . . under the command of General Chmielnicki as General, and the Cossack Colonels Pultorock and Krziwanos, the most distinguished heads of the Cossacks, from the beginning to the recent unexpected conclusion of peace (praise be to God) and the royal pardon thereupon granted, briefly narrated according to facts within his knowledge and partly in his own experience, by a well-known officer, but also a lover of peace"

wegener Soldat" <sup>17</sup> Indeed, if we give careful attention to the career of Krivonos, we get an impression that we have before us a conscious agent of the Protestant league, or rather of England, an uncompromising enemy of the Kingdom of Poland, with which he wants no agreement but seeks its complete ruin

Contemporaries compare Khmelnitsky with Cromwell, as, for instance, a French agent in Ukraine, Pierre Chevalier, who personally knew the Hetman, author of a *History of the Cossack-Polish War*, which had great success <sup>18</sup> In the preface Chevalier calls Khmelnitsky "a Cromwell, not less daring, not less experienced in politics than the English Cromwell" With Cromwell in view, contemporary diplomatic reports entitle Khmelnitsky "Protector of the Cossacks"

Some historians admit that Cromwell had direct relations with the Hetman, but in Ukrainian sources there is no documentary evidence of this Certainly we must have in view that, after the death of Khmelnitsky and the disturbances which broke out in Ukraine, the archives of the Hetman were destroyed

More begins to be written about Ukraine in England in the second half of the 17th century Peter Heylyn, author of a geographical treatise, in 1666 describes the Ukrainian lands, <sup>19</sup> the English diplomat Paul Rycaut (who died in 1700), at first Consul in Smyrna and afterwards envoy of Charles II in Constantinople, in his book *The Present State of the Ottoman Empire*, <sup>20</sup> of which the

<sup>17</sup> *Loc cit*, p 7 "Major-General Krziwanos, a Scotsman by birth, so called by the Cossacks owing to his crooked nose, further a resolute and daring soldier"

<sup>18</sup> Chevalier was the agent of Mazarin for recruiting Cossacks for service in France Thanks to him, a band of Cossacks under the leadership of Khmelnitsky himself took part in 1645 in the siege of Dunkirk in the French army of Condé We have described this episode on the basis of hitherto unpublished documents in the article "Cossacks of Khmelnitsky before Dunkirk, 1645," printed in the paper *The Ukrainian Tribune* (Ukrains'ka Tribuna), 1922, No 203

Chevalier's book, before it appeared in the press, already circulated in manuscript in Paris Thevenot gave a fragment from such a manuscript in his well-known collection, *Relations de divers voyages curieux qui n'ont pas été publiés*, Paris, 1663. Folio. Then, in the same year, Chevalier published his work, *Histoire de la Guerre des Cosaques contre la Pologne* Avec un discours de Leur Origine, Pais, Mœurs, Gouvernement et Religion. Par Pierre Chevalier, conseiller du Roy en sa Cour des Monnoyes A Paris, chez Claude Barbin. 12mo, p 228. In 1668 another edition appeared, where only the author's initials were given New edition Paris, 1859 12mo, p viii, 187

<sup>19</sup> *Cosmographie in four Books containyng the Chorographie, Historie of the whole World*. . . London, printed for Philip Chetwynd Fol, p 1095

<sup>20</sup> London, John Starkey and Henry Brome Fol, p. 218, XIV. In 1686 already appeared the sixth English edition. There are five French translations, a Latin one 1603, a German 1694, a Polish 1678, and a Russian



first edition appeared in 1668 and soon obtained a European circulation, dwells on the wars of Ukraine and praises the knightly nation which inhabits Ukraine, calling the language of this nation Slavonic or Old Illyrian

In 1672 when in connection with the activity of the Hetman Doroshenko, the Sultan's ally, the London papers again began writing in detail of Ukraine, there appeared a translation of the above-named work of Pierre Chevalier. The author of this English translation was Edward Brown (1644-1708), who was in his time a well-known English doctor and traveller. Brown was a personal friend of Beauplan de Levasseur the well-known French military engineer who, after seventeen years of residence in Ukraine, published in 1750 in Rouen the first *Description of Ukraine* in Europe, which became so well known and which also gave Europe the first fully trustworthy map of Ukraine. Beauplan translated into French a work of Brown's, well known at the time, *A Brief account of Some travels in Hungaria* <sup>21</sup>. On the other hand, by the advice of Beauplan, Brown in 1642 translated into English the book of Chevalier under the title *A Discourse of the Origin, Countrey, Manners, Gouvernement and Religion of the Cossacks with another of the Precopin Tartars and the History of the Wars of the Cossacks against Poland* <sup>22</sup>. According to Brown himself, the English public welcomed this translation with interest and much pleasure <sup>23</sup>.

Two other writers on Ukraine whose works appeared at the end of the 17th century, were, like Brown, also medical men. Bernard Connor (1666-1698), an Irishman by birth and a Professor of Cambridge University, was Court Physician to John Sobieski <sup>24</sup>. While in Poland and the neighbouring countries, Connor wrote letters to his friend which were collected in 1690 in a separate book: *The history of Poland in several letters to persons of quality, giving an account of the ancient and present State of that Kingdom* <sup>25</sup>. The third letter "To his Grace, William, Duke of Devonshire, Lord Steward

<sup>21</sup> London, 1673 4to, p. 144. French translation in 1674.

<sup>22</sup> By Chevalier, translated by E. Brown. London, printed by T. N. for Nobard Kemp, at the sign in the Upper Walk in the New Exchange. 8vo, p. vi, 195.

<sup>23</sup> From the preface to *A Brief account of Some travels in Hungaria*.

<sup>24</sup> As to whom, see Du Roure, *Analecra Biblion*, II, 399-404.

<sup>25</sup> Published by Mr Savage, London, 2 vols. 8vo, p. 352, 322. Second edition, 1698. German translation *Beschreibung Konigreichs Polen*, Leipzig, T. Fritsch, 1700. 8vo, p. 822. Latin translation in the collection of Mizler de Kolof, *Historiarum Poloniæ et Magni Ducatus Lithuanicæ scriptorum collectio magna*, Varsoviæ, 1769, vol. II.

of His Majesty's Household " is devoted to Ukraine, which Connor had himself visited and had supplemented his personal impressions with the literature of his day " This vast and fertile country," writes Connor, " is divided into two great provinces, Volhynia and Podolia Of Volhynia the capital is Kiovia, built on the Borysthenes, which was formerly, as they say, one of the largest in Europe . The Inhabitants of Ukraina are commonly called Cossacks I can compare 'em to no people better than to the Miquelets of Spain or Highlanders of Scotland This country abounds so with all sorts of grain, that the Inhabitants know not what to do with it, their Rivers being shallow, and therefore not capable to transport it to other places " " The Inhabitants of Ukraina are for the most part robust and strong, generous, and great Despisers of Covetousness, inconceivable Lovers of Liberty, and impatient under the mildest slavery They are likewise indefatigable, bold and brave but withal excessive drunkards, treacherous Friends, and perfidious Enemies."

" Their Religion is generally the Greek Persuasion . yet the greatest part of the gentry profess either the Roman or Reform'd Religion . The Cosack Priests are call'd Pops, which in their language signifies guides "

" The Language of the Cosacks is a Dialect of the Polish, as that is of the Slavonian It is very soft, and full of Diminutives, and consequently very delightful both to the Hearer and Speaker "

The author later dwells in detail on the manner of life of the Ukrainian peasants, their way of cultivating the land, and the Cossack method of waging war, where he emphasises the well-known war tactics of the Cossacks connected with the so-called *Tabor*, that is, a line of defence consisting of wagons of the Cossack baggage train Connor also gave a description of the chief towns of Ukraine, and among these he writes of Kiev " Kiow or Kiouf, according to the Pronunciation of the Inhabitants, an antient, large and very populous City . The old Kiow was built on a hill a little beyond the River, where are still to be seen the Ruins of many Arches, high walls, Churches, and Burying-places of divers Kings, with Greek Inscriptions. Of these Churches, two remain in tolerable good condition, viz those of St Sophia and St Michael The walls of the former are lined with curious Mosaic work . . St. Michael's Church is chiefly remarkable for its gilded Roof . . ."

As we see, Connor took a serious interest in Ukraine From his

annotations it is clear that he knew among others the works of Guagnini,<sup>26</sup> Vimina,<sup>27</sup> Beauplan, Chevalier and Preftendoit<sup>28</sup>

For Ukraine the 18th century opened in England with a translation of Beauplan which appeared in the well known *Collection of Voyages and Travels* of J. Churchill<sup>29</sup> When English readers were able to make use of the famous work of the French engineer, Ukraine was under the rule of the great Hetman Ivan Mazeppa. Here it is interesting to note that, wishing to draw them on to his side in his struggle against Charles XII, Peter the Great, who of course did not interest himself in the wishes of Ukraine, did not hesitate to offer it as a principality to Marlborough. Nothing came of this fantastic plan, but Mazeppa and those around him knew of it. The Tsar's proposal to Marlborough showed the Ukrainian patriots what awaited their country, and possibly played its part in the events of 1708 when Mazeppa joined Charles XII.

In the November days of 1708, which were so tragical for Ukraine, the epoch-making days in its history,<sup>30</sup> the British Ambassador in Moscow was Charles Lord Whitworth (1675-1725) who there represented Queen Anne from 1704. His reports, printed in the collection of the Imperial Russian Historical Society,<sup>31</sup> show with what attention the British diplomat watched the drama that was being played out in distant Ukraine.

On 21 November, 1708, Whitworth informed the Secretary of State, Boyle, from Moscow of letters received from the headquarters of the Tsar and was surprised that the letters "make no mention of an accident that will probably give a new turn to these affairs, and is confirmed by so many different ways as leave no room to doubt of the truth. That is the revolt of General Mazeppa to the King of Sweden with all his family and riches. This gentleman is near seventy years old, was extremely considered and relied on by the Czar, has no child, but a nephew, and has heaped up vast sums of money in that wealthy province, where he governed so long with little less authority than a sovereign prince, so that I cannot learn what

<sup>26</sup> *Sarmatiae Europae descriptio* Spiræ, 1581. Fol.

<sup>27</sup> *Istoria della guerra civile di Polonia* di Don Alberto Vimina. Venezia, 1671. 4to.

<sup>28</sup> *Commentariorum de rebus Suecicis*, libri XXVI, Utrecht, 1686. Fol.

<sup>29</sup> 1704, five vols. Folio. The work of Beauplan (in full) is found in the first volume, pp 571-610, under the title *A Description of Ukraine*. Written in French by the Sieur de Beauplan. See also editions of 1752 and 1764. I may add that in the last edition there is only a small fragment of Beauplan.

<sup>30</sup> See Elie Borshak and René Martel, *Vie de Mazeppa*. Paris, Calmann Lévy, 1931. 8vo, p. xii, 191.

<sup>31</sup> Vols. 39 and 50, for us the last-named is the most important.

disgust or expectation may have drawn him to engage in new councils and actions in such an advanced, decrepit age As to the day, the manner, and other circumstances of his retreat, I cannot yet relate anything . By next post I hope to know something clearer "

Indeed on 28 November Whitworth, on the basis of official Russian information, tells his Government of the alliance of Mazeppa with Charles XII, and in the following reports the British Ambassador closely follows the events in Ukraine ; but, not having any informants of his own there, he was compelled to limit himself to repeating the official sources On 20 February, 1709, for instance, on the occasion of the demagogic manifestos of the Tsar against Mazeppa, Whitworth writes " The Czar has published a declaration to let the Cozacks see Mr Mazeppa really designed to bring them under the old yoke of Poland, instead of erecting a free republick as was given out in his first manifest. . . ." Completely relying on the Tsar's information, Whitworth reported on 21 August 1709 to his Government such fantastic news as that the Pasha at Bender had promised to hand over Mazeppa to the Tsar, and that now the Pasha " denied him a house in the town, with the severe reflexion that none there was good enough for one, who could not live contented in the rich palaces he had in Russia . " All this, of course, was imaginary After Poltava, up to the very death of Mazeppa, he lived in Bender in great esteem , and the Ambassador himself lost faith in the Tsar's information and on 31 October, 1709, he writes from Moscow : " It is said here that old General Mazeppa died in Bender at the beginning of September, but such reports so often spread here without just grounds, that I am scarce willing to mention them ."

This time the Tsar was right Mazeppa had died, only not in the beginning of September but on 2 October, 1709 <sup>32</sup>

In 1710, at the request of his Government, Lord Whitworth drew up a report on the state of the Tsar's dominions <sup>33</sup> The Ambassador

<sup>32</sup> For details of the death of Mazeppa, see E Borshak and R Martel, *Vie de Mazeppa*, pp 169 and 59

<sup>33</sup> It was printed several years later under the title *An Account of Russia as it was in the year 1710*, by Charles Lord Whitworth Printed at Strawberry Hill, MDCCXVIII 8vo, p xxiv, 158 It is the greatest bibliographical rarity, as it was printed in the private press of Horace Walpole on his estate at Strawberry Hill The preface to the report of Whitworth is also perhaps written by Walpole In the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris (Réserve M 815) there is preserved a copy bound with the arms of Walpole A new edition is to be found in the collection *Dodley's fugitive Pieces on Various Subjects*, by several authors London, 1771 8vo, II, pp 163-231 In the British Museum is preserved the correspondence of Whitworth in fifty volumes The tenth volume contains papers relating to the matter in question, but it is a duplicate of documents from the Foreign Office, printed in issues of the Russian Historical Society.

devotes two separate paragraphs to the "Cossacks of the Ukraine"<sup>34</sup> and the Zaporogs<sup>35</sup> Of the country of the Cossacks, Whitworth writes "their dominions extending several hundred miles between the rivers Boristhenes, or Neiper, and the Don, in 1654, they, with their Hetman, on ill usage revolted from Poland, and put themselves under the Czar's protection. . . This country is extremely well peopled, and tilled the villages are large and neatly built with wood, they drive a great trade, in hemp, pot-ash, wax, corn and cattle" The Cossacks are very much attached to their freedom, and "from hence sprung an universal discontent, and the revolt of Mazeppa to the King of Sweden the residence town of Baturin was immediately taken and burnt, and above six thousand<sup>36</sup> persons put to the sword without distinction of age or sex "

At the same time as Lord Whitworth, there lived in the Russian service an English engineer, Perry (1670-1732) After a sojourn of sixteen years in Russia, Perry returned to his own country, where he described his impressions in a book which was widely circulated in Europe, "*The State of Russia under the present Czar*"<sup>37</sup> Perry personally knew Mazeppa, and in his opinion Charles XII marched "directly into the Ukraine he being invited by General Mazeppa (or the Hetman) of the Cossacks who inhabit that country and are under the protection of the Czar as they formerly were under that of the Poles" With great indignation, Perry describes the inhuman destruction by the Tsar of the Hetman's capital of Baturin, especially dwelling on the person of the hero Konigsen, a Saxon by birth, who commanded the Hetman's artillery in Baturin, was mortally wounded, and broken on the wheel when already dead<sup>38</sup>

At the solemn burial of Mazeppa in Bender was present a representative of England with Charles XII. His name is unknown to us, but from 1711 the English Government was represented in Bender with the Swedish King by Captain Jefferye He entered into relations with Mazeppa's followers in the person of the Hetman Philip Orlik, Mazeppa's heir Jefferye's reports were published by the Swedish

<sup>34</sup> *Idem*, pp. 22-24.

<sup>35</sup> *Idem*, pp. 25-26

<sup>36</sup> As a matter of fact, 15,000 persons were killed at Baturin.

<sup>37</sup> By Captain John Perry, London, printed for Benjamin Tooke, 1716. 8vo, p. 280 In French: *État présent de la Grande Russie*, La Haye, 1717, 12mo, p. 271, in Dutch: *Tegenwoordige Staat van Groot Rusland*, T'Amsterdam, 1717 8vo, p. 393, in German: *Der jetzige Staat von Rusland oder Moscau*, Leipzig, 1717 8vo

<sup>38</sup> This same Perry, in 1715, worked at the Volga-Don Canal, where Peter drove to work some thousands of Cossacks who died there and left such a painful memory in Ukrainian popular poetry

Historical Society<sup>39</sup> and from them it is clear how carefully the English diplomat followed the activity of the Mazeppa group

On 4 April, 1712, the Hetman Orlik addressed a long manifesto to European public opinion to explain his treaty with the Sultan<sup>40</sup> " Nous avons cru," wrote Orlik, " devoir informer les Rois, Princes, Républiques et autres États Chrétiens des raisons qui m'ont porté à venir dans l'Empire Ottoman et à prendre aujourd'hui les armes contre le Tsar Moscovite, ne doutant plus que cette démarche ne soit mal interprétée par plusieurs, surtout par ceux qui ignorent la justice de notre cause, ou qui sont prévenus par les artifices de nos ennemis "

After relating the fate of Ukraine, beginning from the time of Khmelnitsky, and explaining the reasons of Mazeppa's rebellion, Orlik continues " In a solemn treaty of alliance the Sultan has assured us that his object is not to conquer Ukraine and annex it to his empire, but ' de rétablir cet état dans l'ancienne constitution de leur gouvernement pour mettre une barrière entre l'Empire Ottoman et l'état du Tsar Moscovite ' "

Orlik sent a copy of his treaty with the Sultan, possibly through Jefferye, to the Queen of England, with an accompanying letter in which he assured her that this treaty was not only not against peace in Europe, but could on the contrary very much help toward a balance in Europe by weakening the power of the Muscovite State<sup>41</sup>

Orlik had his reasons for addressing a letter to the Queen of England, as, supported by French diplomacy in Constantinople, he knew that England was at that time more and more inclined towards the Tsar. As a matter of fact, from a report of Jefferye on 16 March, 1712, when the Cossack-Turkish agreement already existed *de facto*, we see how the English representative wrote of this treaty, he greatly exaggerates the forces of the Porte, for with Orlik there were 70,000 Cossacks alone, and it " will be the interest of all Christian Potentates, especially of the Neighbouring Princes, to endeavour to prevent the same in time . . . "

Seven years passed, and English policy in the East of Europe changed radically. England herself entered into immediate relations with the leader of the Ukrainian separatists. This fact was first

<sup>39</sup> Kapten Jefferyes Bref till Engelska Regeringen Från Bender och Adrianopel, 1711-1714, genom Ernst Carlson. Historiska Handlingar de 16 w 2. Stockholm, 1897. 8vo, p. 123

<sup>40</sup> Published for the first time by us in the documents of the archives of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. See our " Hetman Philip Orlik and France," L'viv, *Journal of the Scientific Society of Shevchenko*, vol. 134, pp. 134-6

<sup>41</sup> This letter was published by us in *Stara Ukraina*, L'viv, 1924, p. 186.

discovered by ourselves. Unfortunately, not being able to dwell here in detail on this so far unknown phase of Anglo-Ukrainian relations, we will treat only its chief features.

After the death of Charles XII in 1718, Peter the Great was at the apogee of his power. For the first time the so-called "Russian danger" appeared before Europe, and this danger was most of all, felt in England. "The English King, if he could, would raise the whole world against the Tsar," complained the Tsar's Ambassador in Vienna, Lanchinsky,<sup>42</sup> "The English King and his people are everywhere seeking means of limiting the power of the Russian Tsar in the Baltic Sea," so, on the other side, asserted the first French Minister in instructions to his Ambassador in Stockholm. In the Parliament in London took place keen debates on Muscovite competition in the Baltic Sea, and the Government inspired a pamphlet<sup>43</sup> in which we read "The Muscovites have taken the place of all other European nations. Trade, which was once free in this sea, is now groaning under the despotism of the Moscow Czar and summons all Europe to vengeance."

On 5 January, 1719, the Holy Russian Empire and George I signed the treaty of Vienna, directed against the Tsar. The latter, in answer, in the summer of the same year, disembarked troops and a mixed army in the south of Sweden, which it greatly ravaged. Ulrica Eleanor, sister of Charles XII, in despair turned for help to George, who sent to Stockholm the famous English diplomat, Lord Carteret. Between London and Stockholm a treaty was signed according to which the English fleet entered Swedish waters to defend the country from the Tsar.

Meanwhile, in Sweden at Kristianstadt was living the Hetman Orlik with his staff, as he had followed Charles XII on the invitation of the Swedish King. The Swedish Government now directed the attention of Carteret to the importance of the Ukrainian question for the allies; that in the territory of the Crimea was to be found the strong Zaporog fastness which acknowledged Orlik as its leader.

On 17 July, 1719, Orlik had a long talk with Carteret, the content of which we find in the report of the British envoy to his Government on 2 August, 1719.

<sup>42</sup> Solovyev, *History of Russia*, vol. XVII, p. 376.

<sup>43</sup> Mémoire d'une personne intéressée et sensible au commerce de la Mer Baltique. London, 1718. Cf. Lamberty, *Mémoires*, vol. IX, 663, 666, Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans les Négotiations du Nord depuis l'Année 1715 pour servir de réponse au Mémoire présenté à S. M. Britannique par Mr Weselotski, Résident de S. M. Czarienne le 14 de Dec, 1719. Londres, 1720, 4to, p. 20, Chance, *George I and the Northern War*, pp. 333, 335, 340.

"Among other distinguished persons who have relation to the political position," wrote Carteret,<sup>44</sup> "I had a visit from the Cossack, Hetman Orlik. This Hetman is the heir of the well-known Mazeppa, in whose country his late Majesty the King of Sweden suffered such a reverse. When Hetman Mazeppa died in Bender the Cossacks, who had risen against the Tsar, chose in the place of Mazeppa, Monsieur Orlik, who had shared the lot of the late King in Turkey and with whom he came here. The late King was very fond of M. Orlik, and it seems this sympathy has remained even up to now with the Court here. The Hetman Orlik is a man of learning and balance, and his education surprised me. He is a great enemy of the Tsar and asserts that, if we do not now crush the Tsar's power, all the Christian sovereigns will have long wars with Russia. He handed me a "Pro Memoria" on the way in which to stop the power of the Tsar. This (the Pro Memoria) I here append.

"M. Orlik is at the head of 50,000 Cossacks who at present are living on the territory of the Sultan, but at the first call of their leader they will move on Ukraine. According to the information of the Hetman Orlik, the population in Ukraine is only waiting for an opportunity to repeat, this time with success, what did not succeed with the Hetman Mazeppa. M. Orlik showed me also a letter from the Zaporog Cossacks welcoming the intentions of the allies with regard to the Tsar.

"In a long talk with the Hetman Orlik I understood what an important significance this affair can have for the allies. Without him we shall get nothing in Constantinople, where M. Orlik is very well known and where he has even received a charter of privileges from the Sultan. M. Orlik wishes that His Majesty, in his negotiations with the Polish Court and this one, should keep the Cossack country in view.

"I have not concealed from M. Orlik how agreeable his intentions are to me and that I shall communicate them to His Majesty. I shall see this Hetman again."

Unfortunately, we have not found the "Pro Memoria" which Carteret received from Orlik, but we assume that it is the original of a pamphlet which appeared in 1720 in Stockholm under the title *Pro Memoria pour faire voir combien la puissance du Czar est redoutable* <sup>45</sup>

<sup>44</sup> The original of the report is in the archives of the State Papers (Foreign) of Sweden. Unfortunately, we have not at present to hand the English original and have to use a translation made by us in 1924.

<sup>45</sup> *Sine loco*, 4to, p. 8.



It is true that this edition came out anonymously, but among the papers of Orlik found by us in the Chateau of Dinteville in France,<sup>46</sup> this pamphlet is on the list of works of the Hetman Orlik, a man who, by the way, was very highly educated and a great scholar.<sup>47</sup>

Carteret's relations with Orlik became closer, and it was not without the advice of the English diplomat that the Hetman tried to attract to the anti-Muscovite coalition Augustus of Saxony, King of Poland. In this respect extremely interesting is a letter addressed by Orlik on 13 July, 1720, to Count Flemming, the chief Minister of Augustus. In his letter Orlik clearly raises the question of a coalition of nationalities conquered by the Tsar or of joining them voluntarily. Orlik points to the interest of Turkey in the Mussulman peoples of the Empire of the Tsar, "which are groaning under the yoke of Moscow" ("sub jugo Moscovitico genentes"),<sup>48</sup> Ukraine, the Don Cossacks, Crimea, the Astrakhan Tartars will all join hands, and thus the enemy (the Tsar), attacked on all four sides by Poland, Sweden, Turkey, and Crimea on the territory of Ukraine, the Don and Astrakhan would be powerless and would fall. The chief thing would be that at the same time, in the Tsar's dominions there would break out a rising in Astrakhan, Ukraine, and on the territory of the host of the Don (Donskoe Voisko).

In order to advocate the Ukrainian question in person, Orlik, in agreement with the Swedish Government and Lord Carteret, decided to leave Stockholm and travel first to Brunswick, where an international congress was to assemble, then to the Zaporogs, and later, if necessary, to Constantinople. On 10 October, 1720,

<sup>46</sup> The son of the Hetman Orlik, Gregory Orlik, was a French general and diplomat. We have devoted to him a separate monograph, which is being printed at the present in Ukrainian in Lwów. He married Mlle Dinteville. The descendants of the sister of Gregory Orlik's wife have preserved part of his archives.

<sup>47</sup> See our study "In the Library of Hetman Orlik," in the *Literary Scientific Messenger* (Literaturno naukovy Vistnik), Lviv, 1923, x, pp. 260-66, "Philip Orlik as a scholar," *Bibliographical News* (Bibliolichni Visti) Kiev, 1929. In the rare dictionary of Swedishonyms, Stiernmann, *Anonymorum centuria prima*, which appeared in 1724 in Stockholm, there is named as author of the *Pro Memoria* the Swedish General and Senator, Maurice Welling. He was very close to Orlik, and in general supported the action of the Mazeppa group. Possibly he also, like Carteret, received the *Pro Memoria* from Orlik, which will explain the attribution of its authorship to him. After comparing the printed text of the *Pro Memoria* with many other memoirs and notes of Orlik, we find in the printed text a whole number of Orlik's ideas on Russia and Tsar Peter.

<sup>48</sup> The Latin original of the letter is printed in *Collection of Materials on the history of South Russia*, Kiev, 1916, vol II, pp 58-61.

Orlik started, supplied with letters of the new Swedish King, Frederick, to the Emperor, to King George of England, to the Sultan, to the Khan, and to the Zaporogs. The letter of the Swedish King to George I ran (after the titles) "Having great and deep love for the most glorious and high-born Lord Philip Orlik, who faithfully followed the King of blessed memory and Our kinsman and was with Us in the war against the Muscovites, and now when he has expressed a wish to go home from hence, we have decided to ask Your Majesty and Our Friend, that You should give orders to Your plenipotentiary ministers at the Congress in Brunswick to support the negotiations with M Orlik on which We have given instructions also to Our own delegates. Having a full guarantee of the protection of the Sultan, Hetman Orlik hopes, with the help of the latter, to throw off the iniquitous yoke of Moscow and to conquer all Ukraine, the ancient country of the Cossack people

"As this hope touches the common weal and is against the Muscovites and must help towards the destruction of their power, We ask Your Majesty to order Your envoy at the Porte to support the plans of the Hetman Orlik before the Ottoman Porte"<sup>49</sup>

Informed by Lord Carteret, the King of England waited for an audience with Orlik in Hanover, where he then was.

The same day that Orlik left Stockholm, he began keeping a diary, a document of first-class importance for the history of the Mazeppa group and generally for the ethnography of the Balkan countries.<sup>50</sup> From this diary we see how Orlik hurried to Hanover to see George I. A heavy storm detained the Hetman at Rugen, and he notes with despair in his diary rumours of the return of George I to England. Only on 8 December, 1720, did Orlik reach Hanover, when the King was already gone. So the Hetman was only able to see the next day Baron Bernsdorff (1640-1726), the principal minister of George in the Electorate of Hanover. On his talk, we read in Orlik's diary. "Without delay I visited Baron Bernsdorff, who received me with the greatest kindness. When he had read

<sup>49</sup> The Latin original is in *Royal Letters, Sweden*. We printed this letter for the first time in an Ukrainian translation in *Agricultural Ukraine* (Khliborodska Ukraina, Vienna, IV, 1922-23).

<sup>50</sup> The original is in the archives of the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to whom it came from Orlik's son. We found it in 1920 and are preparing the full text of the diary for the press. It is five volumes of manuscript in folio. We have already several times in various works had occasion to take extracts from this diary. As to the MS itself, see our articles "Orlikiana," in *Khliborodska Ukraina*, Vienna, IV, "The Diary of Philip Orlik," in *Stara Ukraina*, L'viv, 1924, IX-X, "La Bohème d'il y a deux siècles vue par un hetman ukrainien," in *Europe Centrale*, 19 October, 1929, Prague.

the letter from his nephew, Basewicz, envoy of Hanover at the Swedish Court, Monsieur Bernsdorff promised to help me in everything. I showed him also the letter of the Swedish King to the King of England about my affairs and the grant of privileges from the Sultan of Turkey, the treaty of alliance with the Crimean Khan. I read to M. Bernsdorff the report of my envoy with the Zaporogs. To all this he listened with great attention and kindness and promised by the next day's post to send to England the letter of the King of Sweden. After this we spent the time in a long talk." The following day Orlik wrote to George I a letter in which we read: "I had great hope that I should succeed in testifying to your Majesty my deep respect in your hereditary principality of Hanover. But, as often a fair hope proves deceptive, so also my hopes as a result of the unfavourable course of events were not fulfilled. . . All the same, by this letter I am correcting my failure and sincerely testify my respect to Your Majesty. Seeing that the God of the world, who subdues proud minds, has inspired the heroic breast of Your Majesty with a just impulse to pacify the Christian world and stop the power of Moscow, which has already extended and expanded beyond all bounds, I do not doubt that Your Majesty, performing the ardent desire of your ally the King of Sweden, will most graciously, as a just and righteous judge, authorise your Ministers on the conclusion of the Treaty of peace to champion my interests before the Polish republic and also that, as just avenger of wrongs, you will support with the Ottoman Porte the question of throwing off the yoke of Moscow from the whole Cossack people." Orlik signed his letter: "Pietatem hanc S.V.R.M.—tis rependet æternus Rex regnantium, ego vero non desinam esse

Sacræ Vestræ Regiæ Majestatis  
humillimus et fidelis servus<sup>61</sup>)

Philippus Orlik, Dux."

For two years Orlik had to hide in Austria and Poland from the agents of the Tsar, and when he was once more in Turkey, in Hotin, now in Bessarabia, the Pasha, bribed by the Tsar, detained the Hetman. Who knows what end Orlik might have met if it had not been for the British Ambassador in Constantinople? Warned of the danger that threatened the Hetman, he hastened to the Grand Vizier. Orlik was able to continue his journey and settled in Salonica,

<sup>61</sup> This letter was found long ago by the late Prof. V. Alexandrenko, but first appeared in the press in 1925 in the Lwów periodical *Stara Ukraina*, pp. 201-202.